

What idea would any one gather from this statement? It would be nothing less than this: that during the "many years" while he was a leading minister among this people, he was, if not the sole, at least the responsible, occupant of the chair of Biblical exegesis in the College at Battle Creek. No one could understand it otherwise. Of course the Herald doubtless published it honestly, as it would give the information furnished it; but he who took it from the Herald and furnished it for the Advocate, must have done so with a full knowledge of the impressions it would convey and the conclusions which people would gather from it. Whether it was published with any such design or not, we leave the reader to judge. But what are the facts in the case? They are simply these: Three weeks before the close of the long winter term in the spring of 1886, the one who occupied the position of instructor in Biblical exegesis, found it impossible to finish the work of that term in addition to his other duties, on account of failing health. It was therefore decided to call in some one to serve the three remaining weeks and complete the course of that year; and Eld. Canright was employed for that purpose. The class in this department having now become so large that more than one instructor was needed to carry it forward properly, it was decided by the College Board, in the summer of 1886, to employ an assistant

0024

and Eld. Canright's name was inserted in the catalogue for that position. At the opening of the next lecture course, Nov. 18, 1886, the former occupant being then busy at the session of the General Conference, as secretary, Eld. Canright organized the class, and continued his work there till Dec. 24, - five weeks. That closed his connection with the College - three weeks as temporary supply in the spring of 1886, and five weeks as assistant in the autumn and winter of the same year: eight weeks all told! Yet he chooses to let the people entertain the idea which they must gain from the quotation that he "was for many years one of the leading ministers among the Seventh-day Adventists, and until his change of denominational relationship, he was professor of Biblical exegesis in their College at Battle Creek." We leave the reader to wonder at the small residuum of fact that is left, after all the foam of this statement is evaporated.

In the quotation taken from the Kalamazoo Telegraph, we find this statement: "At the time he dissolved his connection with them, he had the charge of eighteen churches in Michigan." The facts in this case are these: Seventh-day Adventist churches maintain their regular worship without the assistance of any located pastors, leaving our entire ministry free to act as evangelists in new fields. As a consequence, many of our churches pass long periods without any preaching, and consequently Conference committees aim to arrange the labor in the State so that ministers will occasionally be at liberty to visit the churches, to help and encourage them in the Christian life by a few meetings. At a general meeting for the State of Michigan, held at Ithaca during the closing days of 1886, Eld. C. was present, and it was there arranged that the ministers of the State should spend a little time not favorable for other work in making brief visits to the churches, each one being requested to take a certain district, so that the whole State might be covered. The district which Eld. Canright was requested to visit, though no special charge was committed to him, contained, we presume, eighteen churches; we take his count for it. To enter upon this duty he left his work in the College, to which he never

returned, and commenced the visitation of these churches, which he never completed. And this is the extent of his "charge" of eighteen churches.

He has also set the trumpet ringing through all the land over his wonderful achievements in authorship, keyed up to the

0025

following high pitch: "He is the author of more than a score of books and pamphlets published in the interest of the denomination." On this the shrinking process will be equally marked. His books are two: "The Bible from Heaven," 300 pp., and the "History of the Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul," 186 pp. The first is simply a revision of a volume on the same subject originally written by Moses Hull, and not materially enlarged or improved; the second is a compilation of unequivocal historical testimony showing that a doctrine which he was obliged to swallow in entering the Baptist Church, is of heathen origin. His pamphlets are four: "The Two Laws," 126 pp.; "Ministration of Angels," 144 pp.; "Morality of the Sabbath," 96 pp.; and "Matter and Spirit," 66 pp., all doctrinal works, the arguments of which he can never overthrow, and compared with which his present efforts against them are as pewter compared with steel. His tracts are fifteen: One 32 pp., two 24 pp. each, and, the remaining twelve, necessary to make out the formidable array of "more than a score," are tracts of only 8 pp. each. Against the matter of any of these, we have nothing to say. They are readable and logical, and in some of them the arguments are exceedingly well put. But when the matter is represented in a way to convey the impression that the bulk of our literature has come from his pen, and that his departure is calculated to materially weaken our cause in this respect, it is proper that the reader should know the facts on the case.

We quote again: "At the time he dissolved his connection with them, he... was assistant editor of the Gospel Sickle,... and was writing the lessons for their Sabbath-schools throughout the world." At the time of which he speaks, the Sickle was conducted by an editorial committee of five, of which he was one, but was not the chairman. As to the Sabbath-school lessons, the permanent lessons are contained in a series of books of which he is not the author. The current lessons going through our youth's paper are furnished by various writers. Different ones had written up the subjects committed to them, and Eld. C. was then furnishing his quota, eleven in number, and the only ones he ever wrote. When persons are contemplating a strike, they generally choose a time when it will most embarrass their employers. So Eld. C. whether designedly or not, took a time to leave when there was opportunity to create the greatest sensation.

0026

A few months later he would not have been "professor" in the College, nor had "charge" of eighteen churches, nor been "writing the lessons for their Sabbath-school throughout the world."

In replying to Eld. Butler on reference to being considered for some years past "unreliable," he says: I "was teacher of theology in their Battle Creek College, where I has a class of nearly 200 under me. who studied my lessons," The force of the expression "my lessons" will be appreciated by the reader when we state that the lessons were the

same that had been used in the College for years; he simply copied from notes furnished to him, introducing but one new subject. But worse than for him now to claim their authorship, was the evident misgiving which he manifested on some points before the class itself. So calculated were his hints and innuendos to unsettle the minds of the students, that some of them came to the writer to know what it meant, asking if he was unsettled on such fundamental points of our faith. Speaking of Col.2:16, he says:-

"I have often wished that this text was not in the Bible, and it troubles my Seventh-day Adventist brethren as much as it did me,say what they will." Jewish Sabbath Abolished, p.6.

Among the most surprising things connected with this case is the confession that he has long been doubtful about certain fundamental positions, and troubled over certain texts, Col.2:16 being one of them. We never had any trouble over this text, and we never knew a Seventh-day Adventist who had, till this surprising confession. But now he says he knows they all have trouble over it as much as himself; and if any should deny it, that would make no difference; he has had trouble over it, and hence everybody else has. The conceit which can thus lead a man to set himself up as the standard for a whole denomination, even to the extent of overriding any avowals which they may make to the contrary, is beyond comprehension. We shall claim the privilege of being the exponent of our own views, and setting forth authoritatively the position we hold on every text. There is scarcely a portion of Scripture in the New Testament simpler and easier to explain than Col.2:14-17.

But it may be asked. Why mention at all the matters referred to in this article? Why not let them pass? The only occasion is that they are thrust before the public in a manner

0027

to give to the advocacy of error more prestige than it is entitled to. It is made to appear to the uninformed that the Adventists have lost "their leader"; and this supposed fact is vigorously used not only in this country, but in foreign lands as well, to block the way of those who are zealously laboring at no small sacrifice to advance the cause of Bible reform. Under such circumstances duty demands that some of these bubbles of arrogance and conceit be punctured, and the world be permitted to understand how much of a leader we have lost. As elsewhere stated in this Supplement, the time was when Eld. Canright was a growing and promising man among us. We loved him as a brother, rejoiced in his successes, made the best of his mistakes, and stood ready to help him in every way possible. For many estimable qualities, unless he suffers them to be perverted to ignoble ends, we shall still esteem him. But since he turned against his former views, and began his efforts to tear down the work, and hedge up the way of his former co-laborers his course and his words have been most astonishing.

U. SMITH.

THE "OPPRESSION OF S. D. ADVENTISTS."

PERHAPS there is no point upon which Eld. Canright and others like him who start out in a raid against S.D. Adventists, try harder to excite prejudice against our people and draw sympathy to themselves, than upon the supposed "oppression" and "bondage" connected with this people. One would almost think there was some terrible inquisition, with thumb-screws, racks, and infernal machines hidden away somewhere, with which poor souls were tortured. We quote from Eld. Canright's article in the Michigan Christian Advocate of July 16, 1887, showing the terrible suffering [?] existing among our people. He gives extracts from private letters which he says he has received from some of our ministers. One is supposed to say,-

"I have had many blue times in my experience because of these doubts.... Once I decided I must follow the convictions of my own judgment in these things; but when the time came, the pressure was so strong that I tried to convince myself that I was wrong.... The facts are, I am just miserable.... It seems a terrible thing to take a course that will cause all the cherished friends of this world to look upon you as one fallen from grace. And here I am bound with these

0028

chains." And here the Elder adds: "And there he and hundreds of others remain to-day."

Poor souls: What do they stay for if they desire so much to get away? Why do they not step out and be free? No one would hinder their going if they chose to do so. No one who ever left us received any injury from our people. If they go out and quietly attend to their own business, and let us alone, we always treat them as courteously as other people. But if they commence a raid upon us, we only defend ourselves as best we can, as we are now doing in his case.

He quotes another: "It seems to me that the views held by Seventh-day Adventists are so burdensome that they will crush me. They are a yoke of bondage which I cannot stand up under." Says another: "How am I straitened while the fetters are being forged for most unwilling limbs:... What a distress we are in as a people: How miserable: and is there no relief?" "Another talented minister writes me." says the Elder: "Our ministers, and people as well, are growing to be a denomination of hypocrites by a slavish fear of expressing an honest belief.... I am sick and disheartened.... The basis of confidence is gone, and I shall only wait the come-out of this matter," Then another: "There is a fear on the part of the powers that be, of free thought and free discussion." And so on and so forth. If such stuff was not provoking, it would be simply amusing. What can men be thinking of to write such twaddle, such nonsense as this, in these United States of America?

Here is a little, scattered, unpopular people, with small churches here and there, surrounded by all the popular religious bodies of the land. If these persons prefer their fellowship to that of S.D. Adventists, why do they hesitate to step out and join them? These churches would be most happy to welcome them. They rejoice greatly at such opportunities. Why should they stay with us a single hour if they feel so wretched in our communion? We are sure our people will gladly let them go if they are so miserable with

us. And if they will not prejudice the people against us, and lie about us after they are gone, we are certain we will never speak a word to their detriment, but will always treat them courteously. If our fellowship is so irksome, they truly cannot desire it. For our part, we will most gladly welcome their departure if they feel so unhappy in our company. We have long desired to see the day when none should be called S.D.

0029

Adventists only those who heartily accept the doctrines they teach.

In what does this terrible suffering and oppression from which these ministers experience such agony consist? Are they fearful they will not be supported well? Are they afraid they will come to want? Or is it not the apprehension which reigns in their hearts in spite of their worldly desires, their darkness and unbelief, that, after all, the doctrines of this people are the truth of God, and that they jeopardize their souls when they apostatize from them? We firmly believe this is the difficulty with many of them. The truths held by this people are so plain, and the evidences that God is in this work are so strong, and the tokens of God's acceptance when they were whole-hearted in this truth were so convincing, that now, when they follow the leadings of unbelief and Satan's temptations, a fearful mental struggle ensues, and they are wretched indeed. Eld. Canright himself continued in this condition for years. God's Spirit strove with him along time before he fully broke away from its restraining influences. Many a time the influences of God's Spirit were felt powerfully upon his heart. Then all was light, and God's blessing rested upon him. Then he had no difficulty whatever in seeing that God was with this people. He has not forgotten a meeting at Otsego, Mich, some four years since, when he stood upon his feet in the church there, and confessed this fact with great trembling and many tears. He said then he should never doubt that God was in this work. In his Confession [printed on another page] he himself states fully another similar experience. But when he cherished dark unbelief, the blessing of Heaven departed. The great struggle in his own heart continued till he finally cast aside all these evidences of the past, and wholly severed his connection with the work which he had hundreds of times before declared he knew to be the work of God. Then the struggle ceased. But, alas! his experience since then has shown too well what spirit now leads his mind. Others can obtain the same experience if they choose, and find the same kind of rest in the same way. But such ventures are taken at a terrible cost.

S.D. Adventists "oppress" no one. This effort to fix odium upon this people, comparing them to Catholics and Mormons as an "oppressive" people, is a wicked slander. History furnishes the record of millions of people put to death by Catholics, by the sword, the fagot, the rack, and the

0030

dungeon. Wars of extermination were carried on, and the streets of cities were reddened with gore. Tortures, fires, imprisonments, and the horrors of the Inquisition speak of their "oppression." Mormons have put to death men, women, and children; have harassed those not of their faith, hunted those fleeing from them, and persecuted many in various ways. But we defy Eld. Canright and all the world to put their finger on a single instance

in which S.D. Adventists as a religious body have ever "oppressed" or injured unjustly anybody in life, limb, property, or character.

This people believe in speaking the truth sometimes when it is not pleasant. They believe in what the apostle teaches as a duty of the ministry; viz, to "reprove rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine." 2 Tim4:2. There doubtless may have been instances where men in leading positions have made mistakes and given reproof which was not deserved; but they supposed they were doing right, and apologized when they found they were not. All men are liable to such mistakes. But S.D. Adventists are a people who try "to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with their God." We indignantly repel statements and insinuations carrying the impression that this people "oppress" anybody.

G. I. B.

MISREPRESENTATIONS OF OUR POSITION.

IN glancing through what Eld. Canright has written against what he claims constitutes the belief of S.D. Adventists, we have been surprised and pained to see how he perverts and garbles the testimony he quotes, and misrepresents our positions in direct contradiction of what he has himself written and spoken a thousand times while with us. We have not space here to notice all the instances of this kind, nor is it necessary that we should do so. A few will answer as specimens of the whole, and show the reader the nature of the work he is doing. We call attention to a few as we chance to meet them in his writings.

The first one we will notice is found on p.6 of "Jewish Sabbath Abolished." Referring to the views set forth in the "History of the Sabbath," that there were in the Jewish system three annual feasts, and connected with these feasts seven annual sabbath, he says:-

"So it is not correct to speak of 'the annual sabbaths.' much less to say there were seven of them. There was just

0031

one, and no more, and this one was included in the annual feast days. This even Eld. Andrews confesses. He says, 'The annual sabbaths were part and parcel of these feasts.'- History of the Sabbath, p.86."

If the reader will take the trouble to look at the "History of the Sabbath," and see for himself what Eld. Andrews does teach, he will find he makes no such "confession" as Eld. C. charges him with. Chapter 7 of the work referred to is devoted to an examination of "The Feasts, New Moons, and Sabbaths of the Hebrews." It opens as follows:-

"We have followed the Sabbath of the Lord through the books of Moses. A brief survey of the Jewish festivals is necessary to a complete view of the subject before us. Of these there were three: the passover, the Pentecost, and the feast of tabernacles: each new moon, that is, the first day of each month throughout the year; then there were seven annual sabbaths, namely. 1. The first day of unleavened bread; 2. The seventh day of that feast; 3. The day of Pentecost; 4. The first day of the seventh month; 5. The tenth

day of that month; 6. The fifteenth day of that month; 7. The twenty-second of that month." - Hist. Sab., pp.82,83. On p.86 he says: "The annual sabbaths were part and parcel of these feasts, and could have no existence until after the feasts to which they belonged had been instituted."

This the reader will see is very different from the way Eld. C. represents it. Read again, "This one [10th of 7th month] was included in the annual feast days. This, even Eld. Andrews confesses." Eld. Andrews confesses no such thing. He says there were three feasts, and the annual sabbaths were part and parcel of these feasts, not "included in the annual feast days," as Eld. C. with notable lack of accuracy makes him say. The facts are these: There were three feasts, two of them covering a period of days; the passover, seven days, the feast of tabernacles, seven days, followed by another day of rest and holy convocation. In the passover the first and seventh days were sabbaths, that on, days in which no servile work was done, and a holy convocation was held. In the feast of tabernacles the first and eighth days were sabbaths of the same kind. But the time intervening between these sabbaths, the five in the passover and the six in the feast of tabernacles, all belonged to the feast; for the feast covered the whole period. Each one of these days was a feast day, a heorte (eorhte), but not a sabbath. But the first

0032

and last days of these feasts were more than mere feast days; they were sabbaths. Eld. Andrews is careful, on p.139 of his "History," to draw the distinction between the feast day (eorhte) which Paul calls the holy day in Col.2:16, and the sabbath days belonging to the same feast; and while he says that the annual sabbaths were part and parcel of the feast, as indeed they were, he does not say that they were included in the feast days.

We can hardly restrain our pen from entering into an examination of Eld. Canright's position on these annual festivals, and giving a full exposition of Col.2:16, which has suddenly become such a mountain before him, and which he thinks troubles us so greatly. But this does not come within the scope of this paper; and there is not space to devote to it here.

He sets forth Elds. T.M. Preble and J.B. Cook, who kept the Sabbath a brief period and then gave it up, as the real fathers and founders of the present Seventh-day Adventist movement; which he thinks makes a bad showing for the movement. It would make these men smile to think they were the founders of the S.D.A. movement. So far as Adventists' embracing the Sabbath is concerned, other Adventist commenced its observance in advance of them. But no idea of this movement then existed, and the connection of the Sabbath reform with prophecy was not then discerned. Andrews's "History of the Sabbath" is quoted in proof of the foregoing statement; but Andrews shows how they regarded it of no practical importance, and as a very natural consequence soon ceased to keep it. Not till worthier and more stable men took hold of it did this movement really begin.

He says again: "They claim that it is an actual historical fact that at a certain time about 500 years after Christ, the pope did change the Sabbath to Sunday." A bare-faced misrepresentation. See the lectures by D.M.C. himself on the point, in the spring of 1885, in which he explains the matter very differently, according to our faith which he

then held. That the reader may see for himself, we quote a few paragraphs ["Tabernacle Lectures," Lecture Ten, p.76]:-

"We have shown, said he, during the past two or three evenings, that the seventh day was God's original Sabbath; that it was kept as such from the beginning, and that there is no Bible authority for a change. Last evening we examined every text in the New Testament which is even hinted at as

0033

authority for the change, and found nothing to support it. Yet there has been a change. God's people once kept the seventh day, and now nearly all Christendom are doing otherwise. When and where was the change made?

"Let me call your attention again to the prophecy in Dan.7:25, which has been very clearly shown in these lectures to refer to an apostate power, called by Paul, in 2Thess.2, 'the man of sin,' and recognized by all Protestants as the Roman Catholic Church. The New Testament writers recognize the fact that very early in the Christian era there was to be a falling away from the true faith.

"In Acts 20:29, Paul says, to the elders of Ephesus, that after he left them grievous wolves would enter in, not sparing the flock, and that even of their own selves men should arise, and draw people away from the truth. 1John4:3 speaks of the spirit of antichrist as even then already in the world, while Paul, in 2 thess.2, before referred to, states that the falling away, or apostasy (Greek), had already commenced its work, even right in the bosom of the apostolic church.

"Now it is a very common error to suppose that a practice which is very old, and can be traced back to somewhere near the apostolic church, must be correct. But this is an evident mistake, for apostasy commenced so early that there is no safety in accepting tradition on any subject. Our only safety is the Scriptures themselves. Protestants claim to rely wholly on this authority, leaving tradition to Catholics; and yet, on this subject, as well as some others, they follow Rome, because the Bible gives them no help.

"Now, what was to be the special work of this apostate power? The prophecy in Dan.7:25 shows that his efforts were to be directed against the Most High,-he would speak great words against the Most High, wear out the saints of the laws of the Most High, and think to change times and laws, evidently the laws of the Most High, also, as the change of human laws would not be worthy of notice in prophecy, nor peculiar to this power.

"The law of God [pointing to the ten commandments] is recognized as his rule of action for man. Nine of these precepts are acknowledged by all Christians to be binding. The other is in dispute, and strangely enough it is the only one that has time in it. The first three and last six are entirely silent on the subject of time, but the fourth is based upon it, and its obligation rests entirely in time and its correct recognition.

0034

The prophecy asserts that this apostate power thinks to change times: and when we seek for the fulfillment, we find that power claiming openly to have done the very thing predicted, as proved by the extracts read to you by Eld. Butler on this subject.

"The dominion of that power was 1260 years. In Rev.12 we have a prophecy which shows that the church would be in a 'wilderness' state 1260 years, and when it emerges from that condition it reforms itself, and 'keeps the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus,' that being a characteristic of the remnant, or last end, of the church.

"Now the question arises, just when did the practice of Sunday-keeping commence? No one can tell exactly. Why? if the change had been made by divine authority, we could put our finger on the exact point, and show where it was done. But, like all error, its introduction was gradual. You cannot follow a river into the ocean, and put your finger down and say, There, just at that spot the fresh water stops and the salt water begins; neither can you tell where Sabbath-keeping stopped and Sunday observance began, as there was a gradual mingling of truth and error.

"You will hear men say with all confidence that, while the seventh day was kept to the crucifixion, the practice of the church since then has been unanimous in keeping the first day. I do not see how a man can be honest and say this, unless he is very ignorant, as the most trustworthy historians, themselves Sunday-keeping, too, testify to the contrary.

"Mr. Morer says: 'The primitive Christians had a great veneration for the Sabbath, and spent the day in devotion and sermons.' Prof. Brerewood, in his treatise p.77, says: "The Sabbath of the seventh day was religiously observed in the east church three hundred years after our Saviour's passion. That church being a great part of Christendom, and having the apostle's doctrine and example, would have been restrained if it had been deadly.' "

"Dr. John Ley, in 'Sunday Sabbath,' p.163, says: 'From the apostles' time until the Council of Laodicea, which was about the year 364, the holy observation of the Jewish Sabbath continued, as may be proved out of many authors.'

"Prof. Stuart, of Andover, himself a Sunday-keeper and a recognized evangelical author and teacher, in his Appendix to 'Gurney's History of the Sabbath,' p,115, says: "The practice of it [keeping the Sabbath,] was continued by Christians

0035

who were jealous for the honor of the Mosaic law, and finally became, as we have seen, predominant throughout Christendom.'

"The historian Socrates [book 5, chap.22] says: 'For although almost all churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome refuse to do so,' We see here that Rome was among the first to forsake God's Sabbath, and the Romish Church was the one that finally became the great apostate.

"Dr. Neander, in 'Church History,' p,168, says: 'The festival Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance; and it was far from the intention of the apostles to establish a divine commandment in this respect-far from them, and from the early apostolic church to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday.'

"Dr Neander here calls Sunday a festival, and a human ordinance. When it was introduced, it did not come in as a Sabbath. Look at the word itself, 'Sunday.' Webster defines it as 'so called, because this day was anciently dedicated to the sun;' and the North British Review styles it 'the wild solar holiday of all pagan times.' Now, how did

it creep into the church? I'll tell you how. When the early Christians evangelized the heathen tribes, they would go to the head, or chief, and labor with him to convince him of the superiority of the Christian religion. If he became convinced, he would command his entire tribe to be baptized. They were pagans, and had kept Sunday, as a festival in honor of one of their gods, the sun; and when they outwardly accepted Christianity, they kept up their observance of Sunday, which gradually supplanted the Lord's Sabbath. And while some of these might have been soundly converted, there is evidence to show that though the Sabbath was kept, Sunday was also observed as a kind of holiday, but with no idea of sacredness attached to it.

"Kitto, the historian, says: 'Though in later times we find considerable reference of a sort of consecration of the day, it does not seem at any period of the ancient church to have assumed the form of such an observance.... Chrysostom [A.D. 360] concludes one of his homilies by dismissing his audience to their respective ordinary occupation.' How would our modern church-members think they were keeping Sunday, to go home from church and go to carpenter or

0036

blacksmith work, or building stone wall? And yet they tell us they are keeping Sunday as the primitive Christians did.

"Bishop Jeremy Taylor (book 2, ch.2) says: 'The primitive Christians did all manner of work upon the Lord's day [meaning Sunday], even in the times of persecution, when they are the strictest observers of all divine commandments; but in this they knew there was none.'

"The first command for Sunday-keeping was the decree of Constantine, A.D. 321: 'Let all the judges and towns-people, and the occupation of all trades, rest on the venerable day of the sun; but let those who are situated in the country, freely and at full liberty attend to the business of agriculture.' Speaking of the effect of this decree concerning the first day of the week, the historian Mosheim says that in consequence of a peculiar law enacted by Constantine, [it was] observed with greater solemnity than it had formerly been.'

"And so we might trace the history down through the first centuries. The observance of Sunday, introduced as a holiday, or festival, gradually assumed more importance as a rival of God's Sabbath, until, by the influx of half converted pagans into the church, bringing with them their solar holiday, it began to supplant its divinely appointed rival. The Council of Laodicea, A.D. 364, decreed the observance of Sunday, and anathematized the keeping of the Sabbath. From that time on, the two days seem to have been struggling for the supremacy. The claim of the Sabbath being scriptural, and that of Sunday being a matter of custom or convenience, the ascendancy seems to have been given according as conscience or policy willed. It was not until the Council of Orleans, A.D. 538, that Sunday labor in the country was prohibited, and thus, as Dr. Paley remarked, it became 'an institution of the church,' and of that church into whose hands the saints, times, and laws were to be given for 1260 years; and it may be something more than a coincidence that A.D. 538 was the beginning of that period."

Such is the language of Eld. C. himself upon this point in 1885. Upon the question of the candor of a person who can make such an assertion as first above quoted,

only two years after he had himself explained the point in the lecture as above given, we make no comments. We leave the reader to judge for himself.

On the change of the Sabbath he says: "But the only proof offered is simply quotations from Catholic Catechisms." We

0037

ask the reader to peruse any of the works published by S.D. Adventists on this subject, and see if this is the "only proof" we have to offer. When he has done this he will be as much astonished as we are at such an utterance. It is refuted also by Eld. C.'s own words quoted above.

Eld. C. quotes from "The Complete Testimony of the Fathers" very unfairly, as a few extracts will show. In putting forth a historical argument to show that Sunday was called the Lord's day and was observed as a sacred day by the Christian church immediately after the days of the apostles, he says:-

"The Lord's day, then, is the day belonging to the Lord Jesus, as 'he is Lord of all' (Acts 10:36), and 'Head over all things' (Eph. 1:22) in the gospel. We shall find this fact abundantly confirmed in the Fathers. I now quote from 'The Complete Testimony of the Fathers,' by Eld. Andrews:-

" 'Justin's "Apology" was written at Rome about the year 140.' 'He is the first person after the sacred writers that mentions the first day, and this at a distance of only forty-four years from the date of John's vision upon Patmos.' It does not appear that Justin, and those at Rome who held with him in the doctrine, paid the slightest regard to the ancient Sabbath. He speaks of it as abolished, and treats it with contempt.' Pages 33,36.

"This is the confession which even the historian of the Seventh-day Adventists is compelled to make. The Jewish Sabbath was wholly disregarded by Christians within forty-four years of the death of the last apostle. And this is proved by the testimony of the very first Christian writer who mentions the first day after the apostles. Does Eld. Andrews question the genuineness or truthfulness of this statement? - Not at all."

We have given these three paragraphs in full, that the reader may be able to see fully how Eld. C. can treat the writings of others to suit his purpose. We have expressed surprise at his efforts to pervert and garble testimony. "Garble" is defined to mean, "to pick out or select such parts as may serve a purpose." - Webster. This quotation from "The Testimony of the Fathers" is made, remember, to prove that the Sabbath was discarded, and that Sunday was recognized as the Lord's day by the Christians of that early time; and now let us see what Eld. Andrews does really say:-

0038

" 'Justin's Apology' was written at Rome about the year 140 A.D. His 'Dialogue with Trypho the Jew' was written some years later. In searching his works we shall see how much greater progress apostasy had made at Rome than in the countries where those lived whose writings we have been examining."

Thus Eld. Andrews's first reference to Justin is to show that Rome was far in advance of other bodies on the course of apostasy, and that Justin was himself a leader in

that work. In proof of this he introduces testimony that he treated God's Sabbath with contempt, denied its origin at creation, taunted the Jews that it was given to them because of their wickedness, and denied the perpetuity of the ten commandments. Pages 33,34. As to the next sentence in Eld. C.'s quotation, let us give it entire from Eld. Andrews:-

"And it is worthy of notice that though first-day writers assert that 'Lord's day' was the familiar title of the first day of the week in the time of the Apocalypse, yet Justin, who is the first person after the sacred writers that mentions the first day, and this at a distance of only 44 years from the date of John's vision upon Patmos, does not call it by that title, but by the name it bore as a heathen festival. If it be said that the term was omitted because he was addressing a heathen emperor [just what Canright does now say], there still remains the fact that he mentions the day quite a number of times in his 'Dialogue with Trypho,' and yet never calls it 'Lord's day,' nor indeed does he call it by any name implying sacredness."

This was written to show that Justin neither called Sunday the Lord's day nor regarded it as such; but all of it which proves this, Eld. C. carefully omits, and takes out a little slice from one part of it, so far as it does not seem to contradict the point he is attempting to prove; namely, that Justin did regard Sunday as the Lord's day. And then Eld. Andrews is represented as being obliged to "confess" that the "Sabbath was wholly disregarded by Christians [a sweeping statement, embracing all Christians] within forty-four years of the death of the last apostle; "when all he says is that Justin and a few who held with him in Rome, had turned against the Sabbath, because they were so fast becoming apostates!

The quotation given from Justin on pp. 34,35 ("Testimony of the Fathers"), about meeting together on "the day called

0039

Sunday," etc., Eld. C. gives in full to show that Justin did regard Sunday as the Lord's day, though he gives it no such name, nor any title of sacredness. But on p. 37 Eld. A. gives a quotation from Justin's "Dialogue with Trypho," which shows that he regarded all days alike. He calls the gospel "the new law," and says:-

"The new law requires you to keep the perpetual Sabbath, and you, because you are idle for one day, suppose you are pious, not discerning why this has been commanded you; and if you eat unleavened bread you say the will of God has been fulfilled. The Lord our God does not take pleasure in such observances: if there is any perjured person or a thief among you, let him cease to be so; if any adulterer, let him repent; then he has kept the sweet and true Sabbaths of God."

Upon which Eld. Andrews remarks: "This language plainly implies that Justin held all days alike, and did not observe any one day as a day of abstinence from labor." Yet the attempt is made by these misrepresentations to wheel Justin in as a witness for Sunday-keeping.

Most astonishing to relate, Eld. C. quotes the epistle of Barnabas in favor of his position. Now he well knows that every critic pronounces that so-called epistle the work of a Jew of mean abilities and an absolute forgery. Yet, when reviewing Eld. Andrews in his notice of this work, he says:-

"They [the early Fathers] lived early enough to have converse with the apostles themselves, while he [Eld. Andrews] lived eighteen hundred years later! Which would be apt to know best?"

Yes; but here is a man who claims to be a Father who was not; a man who was a fraud, an impostor, a forger. The question is, What do the Scriptures teach? and we have the Scriptures as fully as he. Now we ask, Who would be apt to give us the best exposition of Scripture? an old forger of the second century who wrote things too silly to be repeated, and too shameful to quote? or a Christian scholar of the nineteenth? It will take no reader a great while to answer. Eld. Canright can take the forger if he prefers.

In his fourth article in the Advocate, he says: "Let us see what Seventh-day Adventists say upon the sin of Sunday-keeping: 'All who keep the first day for the Sabbath are pope's Sunday-keepers, and God's Sabbath-breakers.'- History of the Sabbath, p.502."

0040

The "History of the Sabbath" never said this, as Eld. C. affirms. It was not said by Seventh-day Adventists, as he declares. It is simply a quotation from T.M. Preble, which Eld. Andrews presents to show how his mind was led as he began to publish upon this question. The whole extract reads as follows, as quoted from the Hope of Israel of Feb. 22, 1845:-

"Thus we see Dan.7:25 fulfilled, the little horn changing 'times and laws.' Therefore it appears to me that all who keep the first day for the Sabbath are pope's Sunday-keepers, and God's Sabbath-breakers."

Were Eld. Andrews alive to deal with such perversions of his work as they deserve, it would not seem quite so bad. But a due reverence for his memory demands that such things be not left to pass wholly unnoticed.

Here is another: "Sunday-keeping 'is in reality one of the most enormous of all errors.'" This purports to be taken from "'Marvel of Nations,' by U. Smith, p. 181." If the reader will turn to the page and read, instead of the sentiment here expressed, he will find the following:-

"'But,' says one, 'I supposed that Christ changed the Sabbath.' A great many suppose so; and it is natural that they should, for they have been so taught. And while we have no words of denunciation to utter against any such persons for so believing, we would have them at once understand that it is in reality one of the most enormous of all errors."

The reader can draw his own conclusions.

His fifth article must have been very edifying reading to the subscribers of the Advocate, being composed mostly of historical extracts from a work published by S.D. Adventists themselves more than twenty years ago, showing that there have been Sabbath-keepers all through the Christian age, and that God has never left himself without witnesses to this ancient truth. And now comes one of the grossest attempts at perversion that can well be conceived. He asserts that we claim that the light and truth on the Sabbath question had never been given to the world before it was set forth by this people. We will let him express it in his own words:-

"This confession of their champion writer upsets one of the main arguments of the Seventh-day Adventists. They hold that the light on this Sabbath question was reserved in the special providence of God, to be brought out as a test in this

0041

last generation. Thus Mrs. White claims to have been shown this by the Lord in vision: 'I saw that the present test on the Sabbath could not come until the mediation of Jesus in the holy place was finished, and he had passed within the second vail; therefore, Christians who fell asleep before the door was opened in the most holy, when the midnight cry was finished at the seventh month in 1844, and had not kept the true Sabbath, now rest in hope; for they had not the light and test on the Sabbath which we now have since that door was opened.' - Experience and Views, p.25.

"Now, the stubborn facts of history, even as presented in their own 'History of the Sabbath,' show that this statement is not true; for substantially the same arguments which Sabbatarians are now giving to the world have been given over and over again by Sabbatarians for ages in the past. Yet nearly all who are led into keeping the seventh day, are led there with the idea that this is a new truth to which the attention of the church and the world has never been called before since the early apostasy in the church." "What, then, becomes of the claim that this is a new truth and the light upon it has never been given before?" And yet this is a new question, come up in our day, upon which the light has never been given before." And yet Mrs. White says that nobody has had the light on this Sabbath question till after 1844!" "In the ignorance and simplicity of my youth, when I was ensnared into keeping the seventh day, I knew nothing of these historical facts about these numerous attempts in the past to resurrect that day. And it is so with those who are being led into it now. They honestly think that it is a brand new truth, and the grandest movement ever inaugurated in religious reform!" Yet it is now claimed that the world never had the light on the Sabbath question till Seventh-day Adventists rose up to give it. In the light of the above facts, what a modest claim that is!"

We have given these extracts at length to show how much he makes of this point. Now, will some one kindly harmonize these assertions with the fact that this people published, and for twenty years have been pushing the sale of, the very book from which the historical extracts are taken which show that the Sabbath has been kept and more or less agitated all through this age? Is it possible that the whole body have been as stupid as he tries to represent himself as being? One of the grandest facts we have to present is that God has always

0042

had witnesses to his holy Sabbath from the days of Adam till now; but that does not preclude a special movement of reform upon the subject in the last days. And the one single, simple thing meant by calling this "new light," "new truth," "Sabbath reform," etc., is the connection of the Sabbath truth with prophecy and the work of the Sanctuary in heaven; and this light the world never has had, and never could have, till the prophecies were developed which give it. This, and nothing more, is what sister White means by the "present test on the Sabbath;" it is the Sabbath as viewed in the light of

Christ's ministry in the most holy place of the Sanctuary. John says (Rev.11:19) that under the sounding of the seventh angel, which must certainly be near the end, "the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament." The sight of the ark implies an earnest consideration of the law contained in the ark, and light in reference to it; and when this prophecy is fulfilled, although the Sabbath may have been kept all along before, will not new strength and force be added to the argument for the Sabbath and law by this fulfillment? - Most assuredly. But the importance of the Sabbath, from this stand-point, was not received from S.D. Baptists, nor any other people past or present, but only from the fulfillment of prophecy, as the great prophetic period of the 2300 days ended in 1844, and the temple of God in heaven was opened. There are, of course, arguments to be urged from the Scriptures in favor of the Sabbath as an independent institution, not connected with anything else; and these would be common to all. They would, as Eld. Andrews says, be "substantially the same in all ages." But arguments in its behalf drawn from the fulfillment of prophecies which point out a work of reform on this great truth in the last days, belong to that time alone. And this is just the situation to-day. And it is this connection with prophecy which gives the Sabbath truth a vitality in this generation which it has not enjoyed before. In the light of these facts, the declaration that "it is now claimed that the world never had the light on the Sabbath question till Seventh-day Adventists rose up to give it," is made without thought, or without conscience.

So we might go on and examine his representations that we are time-setters, make the Sabbath a test of holiness, use deception in our methods of work, apply the mark of the beast ages in the past, believe in the keeping of the same absolute time

0043

for the Sabbath, etc., etc.: but we will not spend time on these points which those who have any acquaintance with our faith know so well how to answer.

There is, however, another point which demands a word of notice. It is the assertion that some of our brethren have found it impossible to go by sunset time in high Northern latitudes, and so have changed to 6 o'clock time, by the advice or at least the concurrence of our General Conference. The general objection he states as follows:-

"Now test the definite seventh-day theory in the frozen regions of the North. The day must be kept from sunset to sunset (Lev.23:32). But in the winter there are months when the sun is not seen there at all, so they have no sunset. And again, there are months when the sun is above the horizon all the time, when there is no sunset. Here the theory breaks down entirely, and the day must be reckoned by artificial means."

On this point we will let Eld. C. answer himself. In "Tabernacle Lectures," p. 178, he says:-

"How can you keep the seventh-day Sabbath at the north pole, where it is six months day and six months night? Let me ask in return, How can you keep Sunday there? Doesn't Sunday follow the Sabbath at the north pole? But let us see if there is such a thing as a weekly Sabbath at the north pole. In the accounts of the explorations of Dr. Kane, Lieut. Greely, and others, we find they did such and such things on Tuesday, went to such a place on Friday, etc. Now, that was during the 'six months night.' But the days are measured off just as accurately as here, and the week has its apportioned place,

together with the Sabbath, which can be found and kept in the arctic regions, if any one wants to keep it there. The north star and the 'dipper' give the earth's revolutions as plainly as the sun does to us."

If these statements are facts, they explain the matter fully, and clear the subject of all difficulty. Now, has Eld. C. discovered any evidence to show that these are not facts? If he has, he should confess it. If he has not, his present position shows a willful rejection of common intelligence. This fact is what makes Eld. C.'s position so peculiar. A man can give a sensible reason for changing his position, when he secures new evidence and receives additional light. But he has no new light to present, nor a new argument or additional

0044

reason, which he did not have twenty years ago, and which have seemed to him all these years utterly insufficient to meet the force of Sabbath arguments. But suddenly he discovers that all these old objections to the Sabbath are sound and unanswerable, and all the Sabbath arguments which have seemed to him so strong and substantial, turn out all at once to be mere mist and moonshine. The change is in the man, not in the evidence. He continues:-

"They keep one seventh of the time, and that is absolutely all that can be done. [That is just the thing that can't be done in going round the world. But we will not stop to argue the point here.] Seventh-day Adventists have argued that there was no real difficulty here; it was all imaginary. But I happen to know that they themselves have got into serious trouble right there. They have churches located so far north in Norway that in winter the sun sets at 2 p.m. Nearly all the brethren work in mills. Of course they must lose Saturday any way. Then if they begin at sunset they cannot work Friday afternoon. This breaks up the time so that they could not get work nor make a living. So it was decided to begin the day at 6 p.m., instead of sunset. In this way they would work four hours after the seventh day began. Mrs. White and her son, Eld. W.C. White, were there, and favored the change. This, it will be seen, abandoned the whole definite day theory. In the fall of 1885 I was on a theological committee to investigate this case, and hence know how it was."

This language is calculated to convey the impression uniformly and inevitably, though it slyly refrains from asserting it directly, that this change was actually made in Norway, and the General Conference sanctioned it. The facts are these: We do not deny that there is some inconvenience, under some circumstances, in keeping the seventh day in a nation of Sunday-keepers. That inconvenience is somewhat increased, even in this latitude, when the sun sets earlier than six o'clock. It is still more largely increased in those latitudes where the sun sets at one season of the year as early as 2 p.m. A few brethren in the northern settlements of Norway, under these circumstances, raised the query whether it might not be proper for them to take the usual reckoning of the working day from 6 to 6. But they would not adopt such a view nor enter upon such a practice before it had been submitted to the General Conference, and received its approval. This is why the question came before the committee referred to; and

0045

when it did come up, the verdict was speedy and unanimous that the brethren ought there as elsewhere to go by sun time. And so no change was made. It will be noticed that the question was not one of difficulty to tell when the day began and ended, as governed by the sun, but was only one of convenience, inasmuch as it interfered with so large a portion of what the world still considered the working hours of the sixth day. Of course the persons could start in with their work again at 2 p.m., on Saturday, when the sun went down on that day, and hence would lose only their twenty-four hours.

U.S.

CANRIGHT VS. CANRIGHT ON THE LAW AND SABBATH

We have thought it might edify the readers of this pamphlet to have the privilege of reading both sides of an argument on the law and Sabbath question from the pen of Eld. Canright. It is not often that we can find a man who can perform the feat of arguing both sides of an important theological question with such positiveness, and such triumphant satisfaction, and such assurance of success. Such a discussion will be unique. It will be an illustration of remarkable versatility of mind when a man can say such strong things, squarely contradicting each other, on opposite sides of the same question. The Elder will pose as something of a theological acrobat. For the convenience of the reader, that he may be able to take in the matter at a glance, we will arrange these in two columns, side by side, and head them, -

CANRIGHT VS. THE SABBATH

"That circumcision, sacrifices, the Levitical priesthood, distinction of meats, clean and unclean, the feast days, new moons, sabbatical year, and the Jewish Sabbath, were all set aside by the gospel, is as plainly taught as any Bible truth. 1. Circumcision: 'If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.' Gal.5:2. 2. Sacrifices: 'Sacrifice and offering... thou wouldest not.' See all of Heb.10:1-10. 3. Priesthood: 'The priesthood being changed.' Heb.7:12. 4. Sabbatical years: 'Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you.' Gal.4:10,11. 5. Meats, feast days: 'Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day [feast day. R. V.], or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.' Col.2:16,17. No one questions at all with regard to any of these terms except 'the sabbath days.' But this is just as plain as any of them, except to those who dare not admit its most manifest meaning, lest it overthrow their theory. That this does refer to the Jewish weekly Sabbath is manifest from many facts." -Canright in Mich. Christian Advocate of Oct. 1,1887.

CANRIGHT FOR THE SABBATH

"We are now prepared to show that the law of Moses, the ceremonial law, relating to the whole typical system of the Old Testament, such as the priesthood, the sacrifices, circumcision, etc., etc., together with those civil precepts which God granted on account of their blindness, and hardness of heart, of which we have spoken before, was abolished at the cross, and that these were the only laws there abrogated. Every passage which

speaks of a law being done away refers to these, never to the ten commandments or any moral precept or teaching of the Old Testament. The whole typical system pointed directly to Christ. Col.2:14-17. When he came, in the very nature of things it must cease. But why should any moral precept be done away there? There is neither reason nor Scripture for such a position. We will consider in its order every passage which speaks of the abolition of any law."-Canright in Two Laws, pages 25, 26.

0046

CANRIGHT VS. THE SABBATH. CANRIGHT IN THE DARKNESS.

In another column of the Advocate of the same date he quotes Col.2:16 again, and adds: "Here as before, are the yearly, monthly, and weekly holy days, (Num. 28 and 29) where we know the weekly Sabbaths are meant. It is evident that Paul had in his mind those lists of holy days so often given in the Old Testament, where the Sabbath is included."

CANRIGHT FOR THE SABBATH. CANRIGHT IN THE LIGHT.

"We have a plain statement in the New Testament to that effect whenever any of the rites or institutions of the Old Testament were done away. Was circumcision abolished?-Yes; and here is the proof: 'Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.' Gal.5:2. But where is it said that the Sabbath is not to be observed?

"Again was the Levitical priesthood abolished! -Yes; and here is the text: 'For the priesthood being changed.' Heb. 7:12. That settles that question. But where is it said that the Sabbath was changed?

"Again, the sacrifices of the old dispensation were abolished when Christ died. This is plainly declared in Heb.10:1-10. 'He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.; Verse 9. But where is it said that the Lord took away the first Sabbath and established the second?'"- Christian Sabbath, p.2.

0047

CANRIGHT VS. THE SABBATH. CANRIGHT IN THE DARKNESS.

"But it is argued that as 'the sabbath days' of Col.2:16 'are a shadow of things to come' (verse 17), and the weekly Sabbath is a memorial of creation, pointing back to the beginning, therefore they cannot be the same; for the Sabbath could not point both ways. But is not this a mere assertion without any proof? How do we know that it cannot point both ways? The passover was a memorial of their deliverance from Egypt, and always pointed back to that event. Ex.12:11-17. Yet it was also a shadow of Christ. Col.2:16,17. 'Even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us.' 1Cor.5:7. So all those annual feasts were types of Christ in some way, and yet all were memorials also of past events, as all know.... Paul says plainly that sabbath days are a shadow of things to come; and one plain statement of Inspiration is worth a thousand of our vain reasonings. This is

in harmony with Paul's argument in Heb.4:1-11, that the seventh day is a type. For forty years we have tried to explain away this text, and to show that it really cannot mean what it says; but there it stands, and mocks all our theories. The Sabbath is a type, for Inspiration says so. "-Canright in Advocate of Oct. 1, 1887.

CANRIGHT FOR THE SABBATH. CANRIGHT IN THE LIGHT.

In Eld. Canright's "Critical Notes," published at the beginning of this very year (1887), he says:-

Colossians 2:14-17.

"1. 'BLOTTING OUT' could not apply to engraved stones.....

"2. 'HANDWRITING.' Decalogue written by the finger of God. Ex.31:18. Of the other law it is often said, 'by the hand of Moses.' Gal.3:19. 'By the hand of Moses' occurs twenty-four times in the Old Testament. Lev.10:11, etc.

"3. 'ORDINANCES' cannot apply to the moral law.

"4. 'AGAINST US.' Which of the ten commandments is against us? Not the Sabbath (Mark 2:27; Isa.58:13); nor any of them.

"5. 'NAILING.' could not nail stone; but could parchment.

"6. MEATS, DRINKS,' etc. Verse 16. These show what law is meant. None of these are in the decalogue, hence it cannot be that law.

"7. "HOLY DAY.' Greek, heortees, means feast day.

"8 'MOON' not in the decalogue, but is in the ceremonial law.

"9 'SABBATH DAYS.' Which? Verse 17. Those which

0048

are shadows; but the 7th day is not a shadow, but memorial, and points back. Ex.20:11."

In his pamphlet on the "Two laws," after quoting Col.2:14-17, he says:-

"It can be clearly shown that there is not one reference in all this to the moral law or the seventh-day Sabbath. On this Dr. Adam Clarke says: 'By the handwriting of ordinances the apostle most evidently means the ceremonial law.' (Comment on verse 14.) Look at the figures used. 'Blotting out.' That which was written on parchment in books, as the ceremonial law, could be blotted out with a wet sponge. (See Num.5:23.) But it would be improper and absurd to talk of blotting out what was engraven in stones, as was the decalogue. 'Handwriting.' The ceremonial law was the handwriting of Moses, but the decalogue was written by the finger of God. Ex.31:18. 'Of ordinances.' Here is further proof that it is the law of ceremonial ordinances which is meant. Compare with Heb.9:10: 'Which stood only in meats and drinks; and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation.' Then there was a law which stood only in the carnal ordinances of meats, drinks, etc., the very things of which the apostle speaks in Colossians. Mark that these were imposed on them as a burden. So in Eph.2:15: 'Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances.'

"Here, too, we have the law of ordinances, the enmity, abolished. 'That was against us, which contrary to us.' The ceremonial law, with all its rites and ordinances,

which must be carefully regarded in the smallest affairs of every-day life, was indeed a burden, a yoke, and against them, imposed upon them to keep them a separate people till Christ came. But which one of the ten commandments is against us? Let us examine them. Is it against us, 1. To have no other gods? 2. Not to make or worship an image? 3. Not to swear? 5. To honor our parents? 6. Not to kill? 7. Nor commit adultery? 8. Nor steal? 9. Nor lie? 10. Nor covet? Are not these commandments good, and for our best interest? But perhaps the fourth precept, the Sabbath is against us. No, indeed; for Christ himself said, 'The Sabbath was made for man.' Mark 2:27. That which is for man cannot be against him. Indeed, is not the Sabbath one of the greatest blessings ever given to our race? What would the world do without it?

"Nailing it to his cross.' It would be proper to speak of nailing to the cross a parchment, or laws written on paper,

0049

but entirely improper if the reference is to the tables of stone. They could not be nailed up. Notice now the items which the apostle mentions, not one of which is in the decalogue, but all of which are in the ceremonial law. 'Let no man judge you in meat.' Anything in the ten commandments about meat?-Not a word. 'Or in drink.' Anything there about drink?-Nothing. 'Or in respect of an holy day.' The original word here rendered 'holy day' is *heortees*, which means a feast day. thus Greenfield defines it: 'A solemn feast, public festival, holy day.' It occurs twenty-seven times in the New Testament, and is, except in this place, every time rendered feast or feast day...

"Or of the new moon.' Anything about new moons in the ten commandments?-Not a thing. Hence this can have no reference to that law. Was there a law touching the celebration of new moons?-Yes; the ceremonial law. (See Num.10:10; 28:11; Ps.81:3,4.) Thus far we have not found the slightest reference to the ten commandments, but every item mentioned is found in the ceremonial law, outside of the decalogue.

"Or of the sabbath days.' Here our opponents are in high glee, thinking that the seventh-day Sabbath is surely meant by this; but we are as confident that it is not, and will give our reasons for it. Many of the ablest commentators agree with us in this. Dr Clarke says of this expression: 'The apostle speaks here in reference to some particulars of the handwriting of ordinances, which had been taken away, viz., the distinction of meats and drinks, what was clean and what unclean, according to the law; and the necessity of observing certain holidays or festivals, such as the new moons and particular sabbaths. ...There is no intimation here that the Sabbath was done away, or that its moral use was superseded by the introduction of Christianity. I have shown elsewhere that Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy is a command of perpetual obligation.'

"The American Tract Society comments thus on this passage: 'A holy day - sabbath days; in the original, a festival -sabbaths. The days referred to are those required to be observed in meats, drinks, and new moons. The passage does not refer to the Sabbath of the moral law associated with the commands forbidding murder, theft, and adultery.'

"The following are some of the reasons why this does not apply to the weekly sabbath:-

"1. If it does, then it leaves us no weekly sabbath day at all; for no exception is made. It sets aside the first-day Sabbath as well as the seventh-day. Let no man judge you in

0050

respect to the sabbath days. If one man is not to be judged for disregarding one day, then another is not to be judged for disregarding another day, and so we need keep no day. But who believes such a doctrine?

"2. This interpretation contradicts the many plain and direct texts which assert that the law which includes the Sabbath is still in force and must be kept, even to the smallest point. Rom.3:31; Matt.5:17-19; James 2:8-12.

"3. If this proves the Sabbath nailed to the cross, then the other commandments went with it, and so the law against murder, adultery, theft, etc., has been abolished.

"4. Not a single expression in the whole passage, unless it be this one touching the Sabbath days, is applicable to the law of God engraven in stones, as we have seen.

"5. Every item in the context enumerated by the apostle, viz., meats, drinks, festivals, and new moons, is found, not in the decalogue, but in the ceremonial law. This is a strong indication that he is talking simply of the institutions of that ceremonial law, and has no reference to the moral law.

"6. But were there any sabbath days in the ceremonial law? Yes, several yearly sabbaths distinct from the Lord's Sabbath, which was the only weekly Sabbath. They are described at length in Lev.23....

"7. Paul is very careful to designate which sabbath days were done away. He says, 'The sabbath days which are a shadow of things to come.' Verse 17. This was true of the ceremonial sabbaths, but not of the seventh day Sabbath. It pointed back to creation, not forward to the cross; hence it is not what the apostle meant.... So our opponents have not even a single hook upon which to hang their theory in this passage, but we have strong proof here of our position on the two laws."

ELD. CANRIGHT ON ACTS 15.

CANRIGHT VS. THE SABBATH.

"Now study the great council at Jerusalem, held over twenty years after the resurrection. Acts 15. Not only did the whole church in Judea keep the entire Mosaic law in all its rites, including circumcision, but they endeavored also to force it upon the Gentile converts. Verses 1,19. But through the influence of Paul this move was defeated. If it had not been that in providence of God Paul was raised up to oppose it, the whole Christian church would have been placed under the bondage of the Mosaic law. As it was, that council freed only the Gentile converts from obedience to Moses' law. Acts 15:19, 23; 21; 25. All Jewish Christians still kept it."

CANRIGHT FOR THE SABBATH.

"And certain men which came down from Judea taught the brethren, and said, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved. When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabas and certain other of them should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question.' Verses 1,2. It is plainly stated what the question was, viz., circumcision. Notice that Paul and Barnabas go up to this council on purpose to have this question settled.... Luke continues: 'But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, that it was needful to circumcise them and to command them to keep the law of Moses.' Verse 5. Is this the decalogue?-No, indeed; it is expressly said to be the law of Moses relating to circumcision.

0051

CANRIGHT VS. THE SABBATH

"It is Paul who furnishes us the strong statements against the keeping of the Mosaic law, Sabbath and holy days. Let Sabbatarians meditate upon this point a little. The hottest battle which the great apostle to the Gentiles had to fight all his life was right upon the question of the observance of that law and these things; and his bitterest opponents were his own Christian brethren who were Jews. (Acts 15:1,2; Gal. 2:1-14.) To conciliate these as far as possible, according to his own rule, 'unto the Jews I became a Jew, that I might gain the Jews' (1 Cor.9:20); he himself, as a Jew, not as a Christian, submitted to keep all the Jewish law, as we have seen." -Mich. Christian Advocate of Sept. 24, 1887.

CANRIGHT FOR THE SABBATH.

"A great council of all the apostles and leading brethren was called at Jerusalem to consider this question. Verses 1-6. After much discussion Peter arose and said: 'Why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?' Verse 10. The ceremonial law, with its rites, its washings, its distinctions of clean and unclean, and its sacrifices was indeed a difficult law to observe. It might well be termed 'a yoke.'"

"Are the ten commandments a yoke grievous to be borne? Look at them. 1. Have no gods but the Lord, Is this a yoke of bondage? Who dare affirm it? 2. Do not worship an image. Did the disciples find it grievous to obey this? Did they want liberty to disobey it? 3. Do not profane God's name. Was this a yoke hard to bear? Omit the fourth. 5. Honor your parents. Is this the galling yoke? 6. Do not kill.

0052

7. Nor commit adultery. 8. Nor steal. 9. Nor lie. 10. Nor covet. Where do we find a hard yoke in any of these, which ought to be thrown off? It is not there. Then it must be the Sabbath, if in the decalogue at all. But is it a hard thing to rest upon God's sacred day, to give him one day out of seven? But that was not the subject about which they were troubled. It was circumcision, concerning which there was not one word in the whole decalogue.

"After thoroughly discussing this question, the apostles wrote to the Gentiles thus: 'Forasmuch as we have heard that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law; to whom we gave no such commandment....It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves ye shall do well.' Acts 15:24-29.

"'There,' says one, 'the apostles have enumerated and brought over into the gospel all of the old law that it was necessary to keep; but they do not mention the Sabbath: therefore it is not binding.' Profound conclusion! Look again. They do not say a word about swearing, lying, stealing, murdering, or coveting. Therefore the commandments which forbid these sins are not to be obeyed any longer! Indeed, not one of the ten commandments is mentioned at all. Every item enumerated is found in either the ceremonial or the civil law. The meats offered to idols were food set before an idol, and then removed to be eaten by men. Blood, and things strangled, were forbidden by the Levitical law. Lev.17:13-16. Fornication was, no doubt, one of the minor branches embraced in the seventh commandment; but there was a civil law directly mentioning and prohibiting it. Lev.19:29; Deut.23:17. Observe that this was not done away, but retained because it had a bearing upon the moral law.

"Notice this important fact: The great question before the apostles was whether or not a certain law was still to be kept by Christians. Acts 15:5-24. They decide that it is not, with the exception of four points, which they enumerate. So much of that law as they here specify should still be observed. All the rest is to be disregarded. If, therefore, the ten commandments and the moral precepts of the Old Testament are included in the law here under discussion, then Christians can lie, steal, covet, etc. Yea, and the commands to love God and your neighbor are also abolished, with all the moral precepts of the Old Testament!

0053

"This conclusion cannot be evaded; for the apostles distinctly say that excepting the four items mentioned, no part of the law under consideration is to be observed by Christians. If, therefore, there was only one law in the Old Testament, covering all its precepts, then the great commandment to love God with all your heart (Deut.6:5), and the second, to love your neighbor as yourself (Lev.19:18), are abolished. What a blasphemous conclusion! What do our opponents do with this dilemma? What do they say about it?-Just nothing at all. They are speechless. Yet they will doggedly cling to their position and bring it up again and again, with all these absurdities staring them in the face."-Canright in Two Laws, pp. 28-32.

IS THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT POSITIVE OR MORAL? DOES IT REQUIRE A DEFINITE DAY?

CANRIGHT VS. THE SABBATH.

"Let us consider the nature of the Sabbath commandment. That this precept is partly of a moral and partly of a ceremonial nature has generally been held by the best theologians. This position is well founded. It is a well-proved fact that man's nature, physical, mental, social, and spiritual, requires a day of rest and worship about as often as one day in seven. Probably this principle is applicable to all intelligent beings, whether men or angels or inhabitants of other worlds. So far the precept may be called moral. But when you come to the particular day or time for the rest, that must vary with circumstances, and may be one day as well as another, if God so direct."

"But stubborn facts nearer home show that God's children do not and cannot all 'observe the same period together.' Everybody knows that it is Saturday in India some twelve hours sooner than it is here, and that it is Saturday here twelve hours after it has ceased to be Saturday there. In Australia the day begins eighteen hours sooner than it does in California. So the seventh-day brethren in California are working nearly the whole time that their brethren in Australia are keeping Sabbath.

CANRIGHT FOR THE SABBATH.

"But it is further objected that the Sabbath institution is partly moral and partly ceremonial. It is moral so far as it relates to giving a certain day to God. Thus far there is a universal agreement of all nations. But it is ceremonial so far as it defines just what particular day or portion of time shall be kept holy. This, it is claimed, is proved by the fact that, by the light of nature alone, no man could possibly determine which day of the seven was the true Sabbath. It is asked, What is there in nature to distinguish the seventh day from the other days of the week?-Nothing. Hence it is not so important which day we keep, provided that we keep one day in seven. But the same reasoning would prove that the first commandment was also partly moral and partly ceremonial. That men should worship some god is readily discerned by nature itself, and in this all have ever agreed. But just who is the true God, none can decide without a revelation. On this point there has been the greatest diversity. Some have chosen one as the true God, and some another, till there are millions of different gods worshiped by men. This proves that it is immaterial which god you worship, provided you worship some one god! Who dare admit such a conclusion? Yet it is founded upon exactly the same mode of reasoning that is followed in arguing against a definite Sabbath day."-Morality of the Sabbath,pp.69,70.

0054

CANRIGHT VS. THE SABBATH.

"Come even nearer home than that. The sun sets about three hours later in California than it does in Maine. So, when the seventh-day Adventists in Maine begin to keep the Sabbath at sunset Friday evening, their own brethren in California, where the sun is yet three hours high, will still be at work for three hours. So, very few of them even on this earth 'observe the same period together.' While some of them are keeping Sabbath on one part of the earth, others of them are at work on another part of the earth."

"I have to confess that for many years I was so stupid as to suppose that the Lord himself kept the Sabbath at the same time I did here. I supposed that when the sun set Friday evening and I began keeping the Sabbath, the Lord and the angels began keeping it too. But now I see how utterly impossible that is; for if the Lord keeps the Sabbath at

the same time I do here, then he does not keep it with the brethren on the opposite side of the globe; because they begin the Sabbath at least twelve hours earlier than we do here. In fact, it takes just forty-eight hours, or the time of two whole days from the time any one day first begins in the extreme east till it ends at the farthest place in the west. Will the reader stop and think carefully, sharply, on this point? for it is an important one. It takes twenty-four hours for the first end of a day to go clear around the earth. Then as the last end of the day is twenty-four hours behind the first end, it must also have twenty-four hours more to go clear around the earth, and that makes forty-eight hours in all that each day is on the earth somewhere."

CANRIGHT FOR THE SABBATH.

"When God made this round earth, he also made man to dwell on all the face of it (Gen.1:28; Acts 17:26), and at the same time he made the Sabbath for man. Gen.2:1-3; Mark 2:27. God would not require an impossibility, hence all men can keep it without any such difficulty as this objection supposes. The Jews, who are scattered in every part of the earth and all around it, keep the seventh-day Sabbath. Starting from Palestine, some have come around the world via Europe and the Atlantic Ocean. Others have come via Asia, China, and the Pacific Ocean. Both have met in America keeping the same day. There is no disagreement among them in any part of the world. This demonstrates that men can travel all around this earth and still keep the same day.

0055

CANRIGHT VS. THE SABBATH.

"In reply to all these facts, which cannot be denied, seventh-day people say: Is not the first day of the week, or Sunday, just a definite day as the seventh day, or Saturday? Is it not just as difficult to keep Sunday all around the world as it is to keep Saturday? Do you not claim that you should keep the first day in honor of the resurrection? and will it do, then, to keep some other day? The answer to these questions is not hard to give. The essential idea is that we should devote one day in seven to religious duties. To secure the highest good, all should unite in observing the same day."

"But it is not claimed that it is absolutely essential that exactly the same minutes and hours, or even the same definite day, must be kept any way and under all circumstances, whether or no. That would be legalism, and contrary to the very nature and freedom of the gospel."-Canright in Mich. Christian Advocate of Sept. 10, 1887.

CANRIGHT FOR THE SABBATH.

"Those who keep Sunday live in all parts of the earth, and have traveled all around it both ways. Do they find any difficulty in keeping the first day?-Not in the least. This objection is all imaginary; for, practically, no one ever had any such trouble. Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-day Baptists are scattered nearly around the globe; and yet they find no difficulty in keeping the seventh-day Sabbath.

"The facts are these: The day begins at sunset. Gen.1:5; Lev.23:32; Mark 1:32. When the sun sets Friday evening in Asia, then the seventh-day Sabbath begins there. A few hours later the sun sets in Europe; then the Sabbath has come there. Still later it sets in New York; and now the Sabbath has come there. Three hours later the sun sets in

California; and now the seventh day has arrived here. When the seventh day is in Asia, then those living there can observe it; when it comes to Europe, then those there can keep it; and when it gets round here to America then we can keep it. It is exactly the same day when it comes to America that it was when it started in Asia, though it comes here later. A train of cars starts from Chicago at seven o'clock Monday morning, and arrives at Omaha, five hundred miles west of that city, the next morning at the same hour. Is it not the same train that started from Chicago twenty-four hours before?-Certainly. Suppose that this is train No. 7. A business man in Chicago has several hired men scattered all along the road between Chicago and Omaha. He orders them all to take train No. 7, which leaves Chicago at seven Monday morning, and meet him at Omaha. Would all these men go down to their different depots at seven Monday morning to take train No. 7? They would not find it there if they did. But each one waits till the train arrives at his place, and then gets aboard, and the last one would get on about twenty-four hours later than the first one. But would it not be the same train No. 7 that started in Chicago? - Of course it would.

0065

CANRIGHT FOR THE SABBATH.

"The Lord commands his servants all around the world to keep the seventh day. Each one is to keep it when it comes where he is, not when it comes where some one else is. When it comes to those in Asia, they can keep it, Several hours later it comes to England, and then they keep it; and so on around the world. This is sufficient to show that there is no such difficulty as this objection supposes."-Id. pp. 84-87.

"Another says, We agree that one-seventh part of time should be set aside as sacred to God; but it makes no difference which day it is, provided all are united upon it, which is the important idea. Here, again, they unwittingly admit all that we claim. They admit that it is a moral duty of man to devote one day in seven to the service of God. Thus they give it a moral basis -just that for which we are contending! Again, they strongly urge the great importance of all uniting to keep the same day. They dwell upon the inconvenience to society, where one keeps one day and another some other day, and so on; how this interferes with business; how each one annoys the other; how it breaks up society, etc. Thus they readily name a long list of evils which follow where men keep different days for the Sabbath.

"Do they not see that these very facts overthrow their own position? They maintain that it is no matter which day you keep, provided you keep one day in seven, and that every man has the liberty to choose for himself. Then they turn square about and show how very important it is that all keep the same day! Why, then, do they advocate the very principle which, if carried out, would produce the very division, discord, and confusion

0057

which they deprecate so much? Did not the Lord have as much wisdom as man? Did he not know that it was important that all should keep the same day? Did he not see that, if he left it to every man to choose what day he would keep, confusion would inevitably

follow, as all men would not be likely to choose the same day? Is God so unwise as to leave his laws in this slack manner? Is this not charging God with folly? What is gained to God or man by leaving every man thus to choose what day he will keep? The only way that union could be secured in observing the Sabbath, would be for the Lord himself to designate the definite day which all must keep; Then all would keep the same day, and all confusion would be avoided. We say, the, that reason and the nature of things teach us that if God should give man a Sabbath at all, it should be a definite day, selected and appointed by God himself. That this is just what God has done in the Sabbath precept, we will now show."-Id. pp. 31,32.

ELD. CANRIGHT ON BOTH SIDES OF THE SABBATH AND SUNDAY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

CANRIGHT VS. THE SABBATH.

"A great and radical change in the mode of worshipping God is now introduced. The new wine of the gospel must not be put into the old bottles of the Jewish law, nor the new covenant patched on to the old. (Mark 2:21,22.) Hence, 'there is made of necessity a change also of the law' (Heb.7:12), which was only a school-master to bring us unto Christ' (Gal.3:24), who 'is the end of the law' (Rom.10:4). Now we are to hear Jesus (Matt.7:24), and keep his commandments (John 14:15,21); for we 'are not under the law' (Rom.6:14)."

"Sabbatarians think they have a fair argument in the Acts. Here the seventh day is always called 'the Sabbath,' and it is evident that the Jewish Christians still observed it, and met with the Jews in worship on that day. From this it is concluded that all Christians should keep that day too. This is based on the false assumption that whatever customs and laws of the old covenant were still observed by the Christians after the resurrection, must be binding upon the church now."

CANRIGHT FOR THE SABBATH

"In stronger language the Saviour continues: 'For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled.' Matt.5:18. How could language be stronger? Heaven and earth have not passed yet. But till they do, not one jot or tittle shall pass from the law,- not one. Every precept shall stand. Not even a letter, or the corner of a letter, shall be changed till heaven and earth shall pass away, yea, longer, till all (all things) are fulfilled. Christ is speaking of the law and the prophets, and he says till these are all fulfilled, the whole law shall stand, But all the prophets will not be fulfilled, even when heaven and earth pass away. No, not till the eternal Kingdom is reached. Thus in the strongest language Jesus teaches that every precept in the law will be in force until we shall reach the eternal world. He confirms this position with the following solemn words: 'Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven.' Verse 19. How sacred was every one of these commandments in the eyes of the divine Son of God! Not the least one of them can be disregarded. Reader, if you are breaking one of these commandments and teaching

others to do the same, how will you meet these words of the Master in the Judgment?-
Law of God, pp. 3,4.

0058

CANRIGHT VS. THE SABBATH

"There is not one single command from either Christ or any of his apostles to keep that day. It is not once said that it is wrong to work on the seventh day, or that God will bless any one for observing it. There is no promise for keeping it, no threatening for not keeping it. No one is ever reprov'd for working on the seventh day, nor approved for observing it. If disregarding the seventh day is so great a crime as its advocates now claim, it is unaccountable that no warning against it should be given in all the New Testament-not even once."

"Every mention of the Sabbath in Acts, without a single exception, is in connection with the Jewish worship on that day. (Acts 13:14, 15, 42, 45; 15:21; 16:13; 17:12; 18:4.) The law and the prophets were read, and Jewish worship conducted as usual. Certainly the disciples could not hold a distinctively Christian meeting here under these circumstances. They must assemble by themselves to worship Jesus and have the Lord's supper, and that is just what we find them doing on the first day of the week. Acts 20:7."

CANRIGHT FOR THE SABBATH.

ROMANS 10:4.

- "1. The law is ended only to believers.
- "2. Then is it binding on sinners?
- "3. If a saint backslides, is it re-enacted to him?
- "4. End here means object, as in 1 Tim.1:5; James 5:11."5. 'For Messiah is the aim of the law for righteousness.' -Murdock's Syriac."

ROMANS 6:14.

- "1. Subject, conversion, not change of dispensation. See verses 1-13.
- "2. Are worldlings 'dead to sin'? verse 2; baptized? verse 3; dead with Christ? verse 8; alive from the dead? verse 13.-No.

0059

CANRIGHT VS. THE SABBATH.

"The early Christians for several hundred years continued to call the Jewish day 'the Sabbath,' generally repudiating it as abolished, and always claiming Sunday as the day of Christian worship-the Lord's day. (See Rev.1:10 and any Church history.) After the Jewish day had long been dropped out of notice, the word 'Sabbath' came to be used for the Christian rest day. It would have been better if the inspired term 'Lord's day' had been always retained and exclusively used.

"How much, then, does it prove in favor of the Jewish Sabbath to find that it was still called 'the Sabbath,' or that it was kept by the Jewish Christians, or even by Paul himself? -Just nothing at all."-Mich. Christian Advocate of Sept. 17 and 24, 1887.

CANRIGHT FOR THE SABBATH.

"3. Sin does rule over sinners. Verse 14; John 8:34.

"4. Are sinners under grace?-No. Verse 14.

"5. All this applies only to baptized saints. Verse 4.

"6. 'Under law' means here condemned by it. Rom.3:9,19. Under: '2. Under the pains and penalties of the law.'- Webster.

"7. There are two classes, those under grace and those under the law. Verse 14.

"8. Shall we sin?-No. Verse 15. What is sin? 1 John 3:4.

"9. Then we must not transgress the law, though we are not under it. This shows that it is binding, and must be kept by Christians."-Canright's Critical Notes on Rom.6:14 and 10:4.

"Sunday-keepers assert that the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath, or the Sabbath of the New Testament. Seventh-day Adventists maintain that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the New Testament. Go into a church on the first day of the week, and you hear the minister call it the Sabbath day. Go among the seventh-day people on Saturday, and they call that the Sabbath. Now, who is right? We appeal to the New Testament.

"In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene,' etc. Matt.28:1. Notice particularly; here are two days. One is the Sabbath day. 'In the end of the sabbath.' Very well, there is one day, then, that is the Sabbath. Now which day is this? Sunday-keepers say it is the first day of the week, and we say that it is the seventh day, Read further. "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week.' Reader, which is the Sabbath day? It cannot

0060

be the first day, because the one which is called the Sabbath is the day before the first day. The Sabbath is ended before the first day comes. Remember, this is not the testimony of the Old Testament. It is from the Gospel that we are reading, the Christian Scripture, the New Testament.

"Here is another text: 'When the Sabbath was past... very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulcher.' Mark 16:1, 2. Notice carefully; here are two days spoken of again. One of them is the Sabbath. Which day is it? Is it the first day -Surely not, because the Sabbath is past before the first day comes. 'When the Sabbath was past... the first day of the week they came unto the sepulcher.'" Remember this is New Testament, not Old,-gospel, not law,-Christians, not Jewish, testimony. To this we appeal. This was written a long time after the resurrection-written by a Christian, and for Christians.

"Once more: 'And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath day, according to the commandment.' Luke 23:56. Thus did the holy women who had followed Christ and were acquainted with all his teaching. This was

written thirty years after the resurrection. It is in the Christian Scriptures. What does it say?-'They kept the Sabbath day. What Sabbath day?-'The Sabbath day according to the commandment.' Then it is the right Sabbath, the one the law requires. Now what day was this? The next verse will settle it: 'Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher.' Notice, the next day after the day they had kept, was the first day of the week. Thus, reader, the first day of the week cannot be the Sabbath day according to the commandment, because the Christians had kept the Sabbath day according to the commandment, because the Christians had kept the Sabbath day the day before the first day of the week. Do not think we are reading from the Old Testament. This is New Testament Scripture.

"We turn to Acts, which was written some thirty-three years this side the commencement of the gospel age, and written by a Christian. It shows us the language of the apostolic Christians touching the ancient Sabbath, and how they used it. We find them always calling it "the Sabbath.' just as it had been called in the old dispensation, and using it for religious worship as of old. Of Paul and Barnabas it says: "They came to Antioch in Pisidia, and went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and sat down.' Chap.13:14. This was the seventh day, the day on which the Jews worshiped. Inspiration here calls it the Sabbath day, not a Sabbath day, nor the day that used to be the Sabbath, but "the Sabbath day.' Was it the Sabbath day? Sunday-keepers say, No. The Lord says, Yes.

0061

"Paul, in his sermon referring to that day says that the prophets 'are read every Sabbath day.' Verse 27. Here the apostle calls it definitely 'the Sabbath day.' When he had finished his discourse, 'the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath.' Verse 42. Here, even the Gentiles called it the Sabbath. Once more: 'And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together.' Verse 44. Luke, the historian, here calls it the Sabbath, and records the meetings they held upon it. James, in Acts 15:21, says the Scripture are "read in the synagogues every Sabbath day.' Thus, James still designates that as the Sabbath day.

"Once more: "And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river-side, where prayer was wont to be made,' Acts 16:13. On what day?-'The Sabbath. Who will contradict the Scriptures, and say that it was not the Sabbath? Every one holds that the day here referred to was the seventh day; and this record is in the New Testament.

"Again: 'Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures.' Acts 17:2. It was Paul's custom to observe the Sabbath, as we here see. On what days did he preach there? On the Sabbath days. But this was on the seventh day, not on the first. Which, then, is the Sabbath-day, according to Paul? In Acts 18:1-11, we find the following facts: Paul went to Corinth, searched the city over, and found Aquila, a Jew, with whom he went into company in the business of tent-making, 'And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath.' Verse 4. 'And he continued there a year and six months.' Verse 11. Thus we find Paul working at his trade and preaching in the synagogue every Sabbath for a year and a half. Here is a record of seventy-eight Sabbaths observed by the apostle. Not a word is said about keeping

Sunday. Thus we find that the seventh day is always and invariably termed 'the Sabbath' in the New Testament, while the first day is never so called.

"Again: 'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day.' Rev.1:10. There is, then, in the gospel, a day which belongs to the Lord. That this is the seventh day is expressly taught all through the Bible. Six days God gave to men, but the seventh day he reserved for his own worship. Hence he says, 'The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord' (Ex.20:10), and he calls it 'my holy day,' Isa.58:13. And Jesus says that he is 'Lord of the Sabbath.' Mark 2:28. Then the seventh day is the Lord's day. Those who assume that the first day is the Lord's day, contradict the Bible, and make it up out of their own hearts.

"Here we think we have plainly found the Sabbath day

0062

which the Christian Scriptures plainly teach. It is the seventh day of the week. We ask, then, By what authority do you apply the term 'Sabbath' to the first day of the week? God has never changed it, and why should you?

"In conclusion, we ask, Where did the Lord ever give you permission to work on his holy day? Who gave you liberty to use it for secular work? When was the blessing or sanctification removed from it? We pray you to consider these things in the light of the Judgment.

"When predicting the overthrow of Jerusalem, which occurred thirty-nine years after his resurrection, he said to his disciples, "But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day.' Matt.24:20. Here he points them forward thirty-nine years into the gospel age. He tells them that they will have to flee for their lives, but commands them to pray the Lord that they may not be compelled to flee either in the winter or on the Sabbath day. If they should go in the winter, they might perish. But why not flee upon the Sabbath day? If it was not a sacred day, they could flee on that day as well as on any other. This text, then, plainly shows that not only was the Sabbath to exist so many years after the resurrection of Christ, but that it was still to be regarded as a holy day. If not, there would be no reason in this command. Here then, we find a New Testament commandment from the lips of Jesus himself for the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath.

"Next, Acts 20:7-11 is supposed to furnish some little proof for first-day observance. 'And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight. And there were many lights in the upper chamber, where they were gathered together.' Then a young man fell from a window, and being taken up dead, was restored to life by Paul. And when he 'had broken bread, and eaten, and talked a long while, even till break of day, so he departed.' We notice these facts: 1. The first day is not called the Sabbath, Lord's day, or by any other sacred title. 2. This is the only religious meeting upon the first day of the week of which we have any record in the in the New Testament. This is remarkable, if that were the common day of meeting. But we have a record of eighty-four Sabbaths which Paul kept, and on which he preached. See Acts 13:14,44; 16:13; 17:2; 18:1-4, 11. 3. Nothing is said about its being their custom to meet on that day. 4. There is no record that they ever met on that day before this occasion or afterward. 5. But what settles the whole matter is the

simple fact that it was only an evening meeting. When they assembled, Paul began to preach to them; and 'continued his speech until midnight.' After breaking bread, he again talked 'till break of day,' and then went on his journey. Evening meetings are frequently held on all days of the week. No one thinks of calling a day holy for this reason. So in the above case; this meeting does not furnish the slightest evidence that Sunday was a holy day. Moreover, this was not an ordinary meeting, but a very uncommon one. It was Paul's farewell meeting (verse 25); hence it lasted all night. A dead man was raised. It was for these reasons that it was mentioned, and not because of any sacredness belonging to the day. Then there is not a particle of evidence here for Sunday observance."- Canright in the tract, The Christian Sabbath. We give, also, a few extracts from "One Hundred Bible Facts":-

"7. The sabbath was made before the fall; hence it is not a type, for types were not introduced till after the fall.

"8. Jesus says it was made for man (Mark 2:27); that is, for the race, as the word man is here unlimited; hence, for the Gentiles as well as for the Jews.

"12. It is not a Jewish institution, for it was made 2,300 years before ever there was a Jew.

"13. The Bible never calls it the Jewish Sabbath, but always 'the Sabbath of the Lord thy God' Men should be careful how they stigmatize God's holy rest day."

"16. Then God placed it, not in the ceremonial law, but in the heart of his moral law. Ex.20:1-17. Why did he place it there, if it is not like the other nine precepts, which all admit to be immutable?"

"27. God has pronounced a special blessing on all the Gentiles who will keep it. Isa.56:6,7.

"28. This is in that prophecy which refers wholly to the Christian dispensation. See Isa.56

"29. God has promised to bless any man who will keep the Sabbath. Isa.56:2.

"30. The Lord requires us to call it 'honorable.' Isa.58:13. Beware, ye who take delight in calling it the 'Old Jewish Sabbath,' 'a yoke of bondage,' etc."

"39. He instructed his apostles that the Sabbath should be prayerfully regarded forty years after his resurrection. Matt.24:20."

"41. Thirty years after Christ's resurrection, the Holy Spirit expressly calls it 'the Sabbath day.' Acts 13:14.

"42. Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles, called it 'the Sabbath day' in A.D. 45. Acts 13:27."

We have given quite a liberal amount of space to enable the Elder to show his agility in arguing both sides of these questions. We have purposely refrained from making comments, so as not to confuse the reader's mind. In fact, we are perfectly willing to leave the verdict with the reader, as to which right for the Sabbath." We feel sure the greatest mystery the reader will have to solve is this: How could a man, after

presenting such strong, valid arguments in years past, now turn and present such as he has been giving of late? The correct answer is readily perceived. Canright is now in the darkness. He has stepped down from the solid rock of truth, founded upon the eternal obligation of the law of God, and now stands upon the shifting sands of the "law abolished," "Sunday-Lord's day," and the support of a pagan and papal institution. From our hearts we pity him.

G.I.B.

THE FALL OF BABYLON.

ELD. CANRIGHT makes special efforts to excite prejudice against S.D. Adventists because of their view concerning the "fall of Babylon." He does his best to make everybody believe that we are uncharitable, exclusive, bigoted, and narrow-minded, having no interest in anybody but ourselves, and no sympathy with the reform movements of the day. In order to make this impression as effective as possible, he misrepresents the position held by this people concerning Babylon and its fall. His statements convey the unmistakable impression that we have no confidence in the religion of members of other churches, but consider them all as rejected of God and lost, and ourselves as the only favored ones, whom God regards because we keep the seventh-day Sabbath and believe in Mrs. White's visions. We are, of course, aware that in some instances he speaks of us personally as an honest and good people, who are trying to obey God and be conscientious and true to our convictions; yet, nevertheless, he ever keeps the impression uppermost that we are utterly illiberal and exclusive, and that our peculiar faith makes us so.

We consider these representations of us and our faith to be wicked slanders, and if Eld.C. has any memory left he must know them to be such. He has heard our representative men preach scores of times, and taught the same thing himself, that we believe to-day that the great majority of true Christians

0065

are in the Protestant churches. We have never taught in a single instance, as a denomination, that our little church comprehends all the Christians in the world; have never believed such a thing for a moment, and he knows it. Why, then does he so constantly convey such an impression as he does?- To lower us in the opinion of members of other churches, to make our work hard for us, and to utterly destroy our influence by exciting prejudice against us. If he can accomplish these objects, he will, of course, palliate his own apostasy and please those who hate us and our doctrine, to whom he has offered his services. If he can make our work appear mean and contemptible, and blacken our reputation, he hopes this will make his course in leaving us and defaming us appear necessary and honorable. As we are lowered, he and his work are exalted. The candid reader will pardon an honest indignation at such attempts to bring contempt upon that to which some of us have consecrated our lives as the cause of God-a pure, holy, noble work.

We will now briefly state to the reader what positions S.D. Adventists do hold concerning Babylon and the fall of Babylon; and we refer all such to our published works to be found in all our offices and depositories in confirmation of our statements.

In Rev.14:8 we read, "And there followed another angel, saying Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." Here is a prediction of Holy Writ which surely must be fulfilled. It is contained in a striking prophecy which Adventists believe constitutes the last warning message to mankind, to prepare a people for the coming of Christ. (Read verses 6-16.)

Three symbolic angels proclaim startling truths to man. These three angels symbolize important religious movements in the last days, having each special truths applicable to the time it is given. The first brings to view a mighty move in the last days, proclaiming the close of the prophetic periods, and bringing to view the commencement of the investigative Judgment, the closing work of Christ, our great High Priest, in the heavenly Temple above. The decision is made in the case of every person before Christ comes. This judgment work occupies a space of time, a period which is of vast moment to the race. It is every way fitting that the commencement of this solemn judgment period should be known to the

0066

humble, earnest ones who are preparing for Christ's coming. It is announced by this first message. S.D. Adventists believe the great advent proclamation of 1836 to 1844, which began with William Miller and reached to the ends of the earth, began the fulfillment of this message. The second, as we have seen, announced the fall of Babylon. The third brings to view a people who keep the "commandments of God and the faith of Jesus," and contains a fearful threatening against the worship of "the beast." This power is apostate in character, though professedly Christian (2Thess.2:3-8), persecuting the saints of God, and one which has thought to change the law of God. Dan.7:25. It has ruled for ages. It is, in short, the papacy. In the last days its work is to be fully exposed, and all its corruptions of God's truth to be avoided by his true people, who shall be finally translated when Christ comes. This message takes time to develop and be fully consummated. But it must be one of vast importance to the human family. S.D. Adventists believe the light and truth contained in this message, they are now giving to the world.

But we are now speaking of the second message proclaiming the fall of Babylon. Babylon is a symbol of great bodies professedly religious in character. Commentators generally agree in this. The meaning of the term Babylon is "confusion, mixture." The term is purely distinctive, embracing the great family of professedly Christian churches, commencing with that of Rome, and including all others which have truth and error mixed together, more or less, in their profession of faith. Chapter 17 brings to view in symbolic prophecy a woman sitting upon a scarlet-colored beast, gorgeously arrayed, and drunken with the blood of saints. This unmistakably refers to the Church of Rome, and it is here distinctly named "MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH." Here, certainly, is a family, a mother and daughters. The latter must be those that came from the communion or body of the former, and must certainly embrace churches which are Protestant.

To prove that Adventists are not uncharitable in this view, nor take a different one from eminent writers of other denominations, we quote a few from the many testimonials we might present, as follows:-

Lorenzo Dow says of the Romish Church:-

"If she be the mother, who are the daughters? It must be

0067

the corrupt, national, established churches that came out of her."-Dow's life, p. 542.

Says the Religious Encyclopedia, art., Antichrist:-

"If such persons are to be found in the mother of harlots, with much less hesitation may it be inferred that they are connected with her unchaste daughter, those national churches which are founded upon what are called Protestant principles."

The Tennessee Baptist says:-

"This woman (popery) is called the mother of harlots and abominations. Who are the daughters? The Lutheran, the Presbyterian, and the Episcopalian churches are all branches of the (Roman) Catholic."

Dr. Guthrie, as quoted by the Watchman and Reflector, the leading organ of the Baptist denomination, says:-

"Three hundred years ago, our church, with an open Bible on her banner, and this motto, Search the Scriptures, as her scroll, marched out from the gates of Rome," and then significantly adds, "Did they come clean out of Babylon?"

It will be seen that these, and we might quote many others, take precisely the view we have indicated. There is no other that can be taken consistent with the evident meaning of the scripture. There is no other term but "confusion" and "mixture," that would properly describe the great sisterhood of churches, quarreling with one another, filled with pride and vainglory, and having many doctrines differing from one another. If their condition is not that of confusion and mixture, what is it? Their condition is certainly much different from what Christ indicated when he prayed that his people might be one even as he and his Father were one.

Adventists, then, believe that this great sisterhood of the churches, when they were humble, though they did not have the whole truth in reference to his word, yet as they moved out in light and truth, God's blessing greatly rested upon them, and their existence has been a wonderful blessing to mankind. But they believe when the last days were reached, and the time came for the proclamation of the glorious truths of the

0068

second advent of our Redeemer, if these bodies had listened to it with respect, it would have greatly benefited them. But instead of this, as bodies they turned against the advent doctrine, and have been opposed to it ever since. They have taken a worldly position, leading them toward the pleasures of this sin-cursed earth, and are crying "Peace and Safety," while God's word plainly teaches that the end of all things is at hand.

When they took this position, and turned against the truths of the Bible concerning the second advent of Christ, we believe that a change came over them, and God has not been with them since as before; that there has been a great increase of

corruption, pride, vanity, and wickedness coming into their midst; that they are developing more and more into the condition of a worldly church, instead of the church of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that their condition is now very much like that of the Jewish people when they turned against the truth concerning Christ's first advent. As a body the Lord was not with them as before, and gradually they developed more and more in the wrong direction until the judgments of God came upon them in the destruction of Jerusalem. But we all know that multitudes of pious, devoted Jews were to be found among that people for years after Christ was crucified; and that the duty of searching for these and bringing the gospel before them was ever prominent in the work of the apostle Paul and others. These were gradually brought to see the light of the gospel, and none of them were destroyed in the destruction of Jerusalem.

So we believe in regard to the movement preparatory to Christ's second advent. While the tendency of the religious bodies of Protestants is away from God's truth toward worldliness, pride, etc., there are multitudes of excellent, devoted, noble-hearted Christians among them who are living up to all the light they have, and are mourning over the sad state of the churches in the various communions of the Protestant world. If this view be uncharitable, we must be set down as such. We believe God has given special light to us as a people concerning Christ's second advent and the truths necessary to be obeyed to prepare one for it. If we did not believe this, we would dissolve as a people, and join the popular denominations around us. But believing that as the Bible plainly teaches these truths, we must be true to our profession regardless of fear or favor. Eld. Canright would fain represent

0069

us as an uncharitable, bigoted set because we believe as we have stated. We utterly deny the charge, and propose to show that many eminent writers and religious teachers in the Protestant churches themselves admit all we claim.

Howard Crosby says:-

"The church of God is to-day courting the world. Its members are trying to bring it down to the level of the ungodly. The ball, the theater, nude and lewd art, social luxuries, with all their loose moralities, are making inroads into the sacred inclosure of the church; and as a satisfaction for all this worldliness, Christians are making a great deal of Lent and Easter and church ornamentation. It is the old trick of Satan. The Jewish Church struck on that rock; the Romish Church was wrecked on the same; and the Protestant Church is fast reaching the same doom."

Bishop Pierce, in the "New Book of Sermons," by twenty leading Southern Methodist ministers, four of them bishops. says:-

"The Bible makes a broad distinction between the church and the world.... Yet the vain, wicked, corrupting experiment of harmonizing the two goes on, perhaps in no age of the church more broadly and with less disguise than now.... The process of amalgamation goes on almost without let of hindrance."

Says T.De Witt Talmage:-

"I simply state a fact when I say that in many places the church is surrendering and the world is conquering. Where there is one man brought into the kingdom of God through Christian instrumentality, there are ten men dragged down by dissipations..."

Look abroad, and see the surrender, even on the part of what pretend to be Christian churches, to Spiritualism and humanitarianism, and all the forms of devilism. If a man stand in his pulpit and say that unless you be born again you will be lost, do not the tight kid gloves of the Christians, diamonds bursting through, go up to their foreheads in humiliation and shame? It is not elegant.

"There is a mighty host in the Christian church, positively professing Christianity, who do not believe the Bible, out and out, in and in from the first word of the first verse of the first chapter of the book of Genesis, down to the last word of the last verse of the last chapter of the book of Revelation.... Eternal God! What will this come to? I tell you

0070

plainly, that while here and there a regiment of the Christian soldiery is advancing, the church is falling back, for the most part, and falling back, and falling back; and if you do not come to complete rout, aye, to ghastly Bull Run defeat, it will be because some individual churches hurl themselves to the front, and ministers of Christ, trampling on the favor of this world, and sacrificing everything, shall snatch up the torn and shattered banner of Emmanuel, and rush ahead, crying, On! on! this is no time to run; this is the time to advance!"

Says the Christian Union:-

"Affiliation between the church and the theater is proceeding, we should think, as rapidly as the most ardent advocate of an alliance between them could reasonably desire."

The North-Western Christian Advocate says:-

"It is of the utmost importance that this tide of trifling, and amusement, and sin be stayed, or it will drown out the life of the Christian church."

The Examiner and Chronicle says:-

"When a man like Thomas Hood dares to say that as soon as he hears a man is pious, he begins to suspect him,-when he can say this, and not outrage the sense of the world by it, then we begin to ask what kind of Christians our age of the world has to show. For the insolence of the Sadducees will always be found in near proportion to the indolence of the Christian. Many a church of Christ at the present time sits like Eli, without courage to rebuke sin in its own members, yet trembling for the ark of God."

The report of the Michigan yearly conference, published in the True Wesleyan of Nov. 15, 1851, says:-

"Sins that would shock the moral sensibility of the heathen go unrebuked in all the great denominations of the land. These churches are like the Jewish Church when the Saviour exclaimed, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!"

We could multiply tenfold these extracts from eminent Protestants, to show the terrible condition and tendencies of the Christian bodies of our world at the present time; but perhaps these will be all we can now give for want of space. Every intelligent person knows that these statements are true. Yet we are charged with great bigotry for stating these things. Will Eld. Canright accuse these persons of great bigotry who

0071

have made statements fully as strong as any that we have made? Every intelligent man knows that the statements we have inserted above are true; that the Protestant churches, as this report of the True Wesleyan states, are repeating the experience of the Jewish Church after rejecting the doctrine of Christ's first advent. We have page upon page of extracts before us, from which we could present striking and powerful pictures of the sins now being practiced by the churches; such as church lotteries, gambling, grab-bags, dancing, card-playing, etc.

It is a well-known fact that Governor Washburn, of Wisconsin, in his public message to the legislature of that State, expressed himself against the practices of the churches, and charged them with being the nurseries of the pernicious spirit of gambling, etc. Just think of it, kind reader, a church of Jesus Christ rebuked by a politician before a legislature, for gambling!

Hear what Mr. Moody said at Baltimore:-

"And there are your grab-bags-your grab-bags! There is too much of this. Your fairs and your bazaars won't do, and your voting, your casting of ballots for the most popular man or the most popular woman, just helping along their vanity. It grieves the Spirit; it offends God. They have got so far now that for twenty-five cents young men can come in and kiss the handsomest woman in the room. Think of this! Look at the church lotteries going on in New York! Before God I would rather preach in any barn, or in the most miserable hovel on earth, than within the walls of a church paid for in such a way. What is the use of going to a gambling den when you can have a game of grab with a lady for a partner?"

The utterances of the Rev. C.H. Spurgeon, the most eminent Baptist divine in the world, are particularly pertinent in this connection. Mr. Spurgeon has quite recently withdrawn from the English Baptist Union, and here are his views with regard to the condition of affairs in the churches:-

"A new religion has been initiated [in the Baptist churches], which is no more Christianity than chalk is cheese. And this religion, being destitute of moral honesty, palms itself off as the old faith with slight improvements, and on this plea usurps pulpits which were erected for gospel preaching. The atonement is scouted, the inspiration for Scripture is derided, ...the punishment of sin is turned into fiction, and the resurrection

0072

into a myth; and yet these enemies of our faith expect us to call them brethren, and maintain a confederacy with them!

"At the back of doctrinal falsehood comes a natural decline of spiritual life, evidenced by a taste for questionable amusements, and a weariness of devotional meetings....

"The case is mournful. Certain ministers are making infidels. Avowed atheists are not a tenth as dangerous as those preachers who scatter doubt and stab at faith. A plain man told us the other day that two ministers had derided him because he thought we should pray for rain. A gracious woman bemoaned in my presence that a precious promise in Isaiah which had comforted her had been declared by her minister to be uninspired. It is a common thing to hear working-men excuse their wickedness by the statement that there is no hell-the parson says so."

We will give one more extract on this painfully unpleasant subject. It is from the Watchman and Reflector, the leading paper of the Baptist denomination:-

"A member of a church went to his pastor and entreated his intercession with his favorite son, who had become ruinously addicted to the vice of gambling. The pastor consented, and seeking the young man, found him in his chamber. He commenced his lecture; but before he concluded, the young man laid his hand upon his arm and drew his attention to a pile of splendid volumes that stood upon the table. 'Well,' said the young man, 'these volumes were won by me at a fair given in your church; they were my first venture; but for that lottery, under the patronage of a Christian church, I should never have become a gambler.'"

We well know that there are pious, devoted people in the churches, who look upon these practices with all the abhorrence that we do. But we know at the same time that they are not sufficiently strong to check these wicked practices that are sanctioned by the leading member of the popular churches. If there is an influence in the church which is sufficient to meet these things, why are they permitted to exist year after year, and thus continue to depart from the principle of Christianity as taught by our Redeemer more and more? These things as we have said, show that these churches, as bodies, have fallen, and that corruption is rapidly gaining possession of them; but we believe that God has a truth in the earth with which to call his people out from such corruption.

0073

Will Eld. Canright hold up these whom we have quoted as uncharitable? He has tried to make it appear that the Seventh-day Adventists generally are unjust and unchristian; but has he found any statements which we have ever made stronger than those made by popular clergymen? The evidence is overwhelming to prove that the statements we have advanced concerning the religious bodies of the present day are correct. And he knows they are true. The fact is, the whole tendency of popular Christianity at the present time is worldly, and the ambition of the church is to be a great power in the world, and to rule over the nations,-very much as the Jews hoped that the Messiah would come and place them over all the nations of the earth. This was why they rejected Jesus at his first advent. They did not love the humble, self-denying doctrines which he taught. They had no interest in laboring for that salvation which he set before them. Their desire was to be among the great, proud, rich, and influential of the earth; hence they rejected the lowly Galilean-the Man of sorrows. They never would have him to reign over them. It is much the same to-day in the religious bodies of the world; they are courting the world, and the world is courting them, until there is very little difference between them.

In saying this we do not deny but that there are many good things favored by the churches; but there are many Unitarians and Universalists and skeptics and unbelievers who are just as much in favor of morality and good government as the churches themselves. As the great commentator, Albert Barnes, declared years ago, the churches were for a long time the bulwarks of slavery. They have not led in the reforms of the day, more than others. Many of the most eminent philanthropists for the past fifty years were not members of the orthodox churches. And yet there are large numbers of most excellent, devoted people who are members of these churches. We make these

statements to show that the badge of church membership is not a distinguishing mark of morality or reform. These are facts which every intelligent person understands. Seventh-day Adventists feel that they have a special work to warn the world of Christ's coming and prepare a pure, holy people for that event. Of course, holding these views of popular Christianity, and like honest men proclaiming them at proper times, leave them without the sanction of these popular bodies. We expect to meet opposition everywhere we go. As far as they do right, we wish them God-speed.

0074

In everything good which they teach, we are in hearty sympathy. We venture the assertion that there is not a church in the land in which so large a per cent of its membership favor temperance and prohibition and vote for them, as among Seventh-day Adventists. As a body they were unanimously opposed to slavery in the days of its supremacy, and we claim that there is not a single true reform agitating the public mind with which we are not in hearty sympathy. Yet of course, being comparatively a small people, and having a great work to do in proclaiming doctrines which we consider important for the benefit of our fellow-men, we cannot scatter our efforts, and make specialties of things outside of the one great object which has given us an existence—a proclamation to prepare a people for the coming of Christ. These are the positions we hold. We believe before God they are right and true.

G.I.B.

MRS WHITE AND HER WORK.

CONNECTED with the Seventh-day Adventist movement from the beginning there has been one by whom this people believe that God has been pleased to reveal many things through vision. There has been no effort to conceal this work, but, on the contrary, the books setting it forth have gone everywhere in the front rank with other books. They have been openly advertised for sale to all purchasers, and all have been publicly invited to examine the matter for themselves.

The fact that a woman, a public and prominent laborer in this cause, has visions, is considered a splendid point of attack by the enemies of this work, and the mad-dog cry is immediately started—"Jezebel," "sorcery," "Swedenborgianism," "Shakerism," "Mormonism," etc. Eld. Canright, having now determined to tear down the cause he has labored for years to build up, starts out on the same line of policy, joins this unworthy crowd, and commences his attacks upon Mrs. White.

What reason have these people for making her the object of so much venom and vilification?—None whatever. Personally she has never done them an injury, nor given them any cause of complaint. She has adhered steadily to the work to which she believes the Lord has called her, laboring to clear her soul from every shadow of unfaithfulness, by earnestly

0075

warning against every sin, and exhorting all to the work of thorough repentance and the practice of every Christian virtue; and not once since the commencement of her work, has she deigned to step down into the arena to dabble with the floods of misrepresentation that have been poured out after her, nor to enter into personal controversy with any of her defamers. For the sake of truth and justice, however, others have seen fit from time to time to pay a little attention to these things, as on the present occasion.

The first attempt made is to represent us as holding the visions in a manner to supersede the Bible. Thus Eld. C. says:-

"Mrs. E. G. White, wife of the late Eld. White, leader of the Seventh-day Adventists, claims to be divinely inspired as were the prophets of the Bible. This claim is accepted by the whole denomination. They defend her inspiration as earnestly as they do that of the Bible." "Among themselves they quote her as we do Paul." "Thus they have another Bible, just the same as the Mormons do." And Mr. Morton says: "If the apostles contradict her 'visions' and 'Testimonies,' so much the worse for the apostles!"

All these utterances are designed to convey the impression that we place the visions of sister White on a level with, or even above, the Bible; and that, as Mr. Morton says, if the writings of the apostles did not agree with her views, we would discard the declarations of the apostles, and receive her testimonies in preference thereto. We indignantly repel all such insinuations. These things have been reiterated long enough. Let a single line from any of our published works be produced, if it can be found, sustaining any such view. If it cannot be found, will they cease the calumny? This, surely, is a reasonable challenge.

Is it necessary that we state our position again? We stand on the great Protestant platform that "the Bible and the Bible alone" is our rule of faith and practice. We believe that God by his grace and his providence has given existence to the book we call "the Bible" as a revelation of his will to man; that holy men wrote it, as God spoke to them face to face, or moved upon them by the Holy Spirit, or revealed truths to them in visions or dreams, or by the influence of his Spirit called up to unerring remembrance experiences through which they had passed; that thereby we have a volume composed of the Old and New Testaments, which God calls his

0076

"two witnesses" (Rev. 11:3); that this volume is complete in itself, and is to have nothing taken from it nor added to it; and that this is set forth as the standard and test of all moral teaching, all spiritual exercises, and all revelation purporting to be either human or divine. The skeptic would call this a very fanatical view of the Scriptures; but so we hold, nevertheless.

But these Scriptures make provision for the operation of the Holy Spirit, not only in ordinary, but in extraordinary methods in the church to the end of time. These latter are explicitly enumerated in 1 Corinthians 12 and Ephesians 4. They have been expressly "set in the church." 1 Cor. 12:28. Prophecies of their especial revival in the last days, are numerous. See Joel 2:28; Acts 2:17; 1 Cor. 1:7; Rev. 12:17; etc. Among these is expressly mentioned the gift of "prophecy" (1 Cor. 12:4, 10; 13:2); and in Joel's prophecy of the operation of the Spirit in the last days, "prophesying, seeing visions, and dreaming

dreams" are particularly mentioned, showing that the gift of prophecy is to be manifested through vision. But what was given in this way would not constitute another Bible nor an addition to the Bible. The gifts were in general operation in the days of the apostles. But when Paul said that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God," there is no evidence that he referred to the work of the four daughters of Philip, the evangelist, "which did prophesy" (Acts 21:9), nor of Philip when an angel of the Lord spoke to him, and instructed him to go toward the south, where he met the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8:26), nor of Cornelius when he was instructed in vision by an angel to send for Peter (Acts 10:3), nor of those who came down from Jerusalem. Acts 21:11. Nor has "the abundance of the revelations" with which Paul was favored (2Cor.12:7), been incorporated into the book known as "the volume of inspiration." They probably related more to the local duties and necessities of those times. But in all these instances, as well as those mentioned above, God was imparting instruction to his people by his Holy Spirit; though it was not designed to enter into that volume which he was preparing for the world as a general revelation of his will.

In saying this, we detract in no jot or tittle from the sacredness

0077

or importance of the gift of prophecy in the church, nor of our obligation to be instructed thereby. When a manifestation is given, and, being tested by the Scriptures, is found in the circumstances of its giving, its nature, and its tendency to be a genuine operation of the Spirit, we would submit to any candid person to say how it should be regarded. It comes to us as a divine message; it is "a ray of light from the throne"; it is instruction by the Holy Spirit; and to resist it, knowingly, is to resist the Spirit, as did the Jews to whom Stephen said; "Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye." Acts 7:51.

The manifestation of the gift of prophecy, ordinarily, according to the cases referred to, involves a vision; and a vision involves the agency of angels, as "He saw in vision... an angel of God coming in to him." etc. Acts 10:3. The one in vision talks with the angel, and receives instruction from him. So Paul, in vision, was caught up into the third heaven, into paradise, evidently into the presence of God, and heard words not possible to be expressed in human speech (2Cor.12:1-4, Margin); and when a person under such circumstances receives a message from the Lord to be imparted to men, could he, or she, say anything less than that it was a message from the Lord, and whatever treatment they accorded to it, it was to the Lord and not to her? In so saying she does not "vault herself right into the place of God himself," as is "slandrously reported." Rom.3:8; Advocate, Oct. 8, 1887. If, to illustrate, the President of the United States should send a message by a courier to the collector of customs at New York, and the courier should tell the collector that it was a message from the President, and that as he treated it, so he would be treating the President, would he thereby "vault himself right into" the presidential chair? Nonsense!

And the angelic agency may be the same that was employed in the visions of Daniel and John. John says: "And I fell at his {the angel's} feet to worship him. And he said unto me:... I am thy fellow-servant, and [the fellow-servant] of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus; worship God; for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of

prophecy." The "spirit of prophecy" must be the same as "the gift of prophecy," even if we read it, "spirit of the prophecy," as some prefer. Then the language of this angel would imply that he

0078

had charge of the gift of prophecy, or was the one particularly concerned in the manifestation of that gift; and that, as he was the one then present with John, he would be the one present with those who had in exercise the gift of prophecy. This angle can easily be identified with the one through whom Daniel received communications.

And the operation of the gift of prophecy, the "seeing visions," according to the prophecy of the last days, may be in circumstance and manner, almost if not quite identical with those of the visions given in the times of both Daniel and John. At any rate, the condition of sister White in vision corresponds exactly with that of Daniel and John, as they have themselves described it. See Daniel 8:27; 10:8-17; Rev. 1:17.

But now Eld. Canright comes forth in the role of a medical examiner, and pronounces all sister White's visions the result of catalepsy, hysteria, and ecstasy! On the same grounds we may decide that Daniel and John had some wonderful cataleptic fits; for the conditions are the same. Does he know that in this cavil he is following in the footsteps of skeptics who bring the same objection against the visions and the revelations of the Scriptures themselves, that is, that they are the result of diseased bodies and disordered imaginations? But such is the fact, as noticed by Dr. Geikie. Let us see how we could ever have a fulfillment of Joel's prophecy on this hypothesis. "I will pour out my Spirit," says the Lord, "upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy." The time arrives, the Spirit is poured out, and some daughter in Israel begins to have visions. Of course the truth has its enemies, and especially every manifestation of the Spirit meets with violent opposition. And as the conditions of one in vision become manifest-suspension of all external senses, no strength, no breath, unconsciousness to all earthly scenes, as seen in all true visions according to the Scripture narratives-they cry out, "Oh! no vision! no fulfillment of prophecy! cataleptic fit!"

We shall not attempt to follow our new doctor into all the profundity of this medical science, but may be allowed to refer to a fact or two which are within the comprehension of common people. Webster quotes Dunglison as his best authority on medical question; and under "catalepsy" he says: "(Med.) A sudden suspension of the action of the senses and of volition, the body and limbs preserving the position given

0079

them, while the action of the heart and lungs continues.-Dunglison." But in the case of sister White, the body and limbs do not preserve the position given them, do not retain a fixed position, but she makes such calm and graceful gestures as the nature of the scene before her suggests; and the action of the lungs does not continue. So there cannot be much catalepsy here. Under "hysteria" he says: "(Med.) A species of neurosis or nervous affection, generally occurring in paroxysms, the principal characteristics of which consist in alternate fits of laughing and crying, with a sensation as if a ball... proceeded through the stomach, chest, and neck, producing a sense of strangulation, It is

sometimes attended with convulsions, and is variable as to the time of attacking a person. Dungleison." Wonderfully like sister White when in vision, isn't it, as those can testify who have witnessed it! It is enough to give a man catalepsy, hysteria, and everything else, to hear such things applied to her, Such a wonderful case of catalepsy ought to engage the attention of the medical fraternity throughout the United States.

We cannot dwell longer upon this part of the subject. In his closing article in the Advocate, he devotes a portion of the space to "Mrs. White's Mistakes;" and in a few words respecting these, the reader may be interested.

1. The old shut-door hobgoblin is again thrust forward. As the first mistake, it is charged upon her that she saw in vision that there was no more salvation for sinners after 1844. This we deny in toto. See explanations on another page and in different numbers of the REVIEW, and other works, especially in "Early Writings."

2. She represents that there will be slaves when Jesus comes; but there are now no slaves. Hence there is here a great mistake. Is any one able to predict to a certainty that there will be no slaves when Christ appears? Not only is the vision involved in this matter, but Rev.6:14-17, as well. That speaks of "free men" and "bondmen" together, when the great day of wrath comes. Rev.18:13 also speaks of slaves as a part of the merchandise of great Babylon, at the time of her destruction. We know that political and social chaos is before this nation, and who can tell to what lengths the bad traits of men will then carry them? It is altogether too soon to predicate a failure on this point.

3. "Nations angry" thirty-eight years ago. He thinks "it takes them a long time to get fighting mad." The anger of

0080

the nations began with the great revolution of 1848. They have been "fighting mad" much of the time since; but the winds have been held. Rev.7:1.

4,5 and 6. "Some looking too far off for the coming of the Lord." "Time for Jesus to be in the most holy place nearly finished." "A few months only [left] in 1849." See all these fully explained in "Answers to Objections to the Visions."

7. "She broke the Sabbath for eleven years." All she saw upon the subject was, that the Sabbath commenced at "even." Astronomical and nautical science was allowed to fix "even" at 6 o'clock, till a further examination showed that the Bible will admit of no other definition of "even" for the commencement of the day but sunset. This shows the danger of letting "science" govern Biblical questions.

8. Immediate destruction predicted to men who have left them. The mistake the objector makes here is in supposing that she refers to their "destruction"; whereas she refers only to their going so far from the truth as to preclude their return. And no believer will deny this.

9. Under this head mention is made of "the rebellion," "slavery," "conduct of the war," "interference of England," "fall of our nation," and the "seeming impossibility for slavery to be done away." It seemed impossible," she says, for the war to be conducted successfully, and for slavery to be done away. This does not say that either of these things would not be, but speaks only of the outlook at a certain time. Much of that vision relates to the future. And when the "time of trouble such a never was since there was a nation" comes when Michael stands up, that is, when the Kingdom of Christ begins (Dan.

12:1), who can predict what changes will occur? It is too soon yet to decide that question.

These are all the points which he thinks worth while to bring before the readers of the Advocate; but he promises a forth-coming book, by which we presume he designs to sweep away clean everything which his articles have left. It will receive due attention, if thought worthy of it, when it appears.

U. S.

0081

ELD. CANRIGHT'S TREATMENT OF ELD. AND MRS. WHITE.

INGRATITUDE to those who have shown us much love and many acts of kindness, is never commendable. Repaying such acts of favor with bitterness and misrepresentation is still worse. And worst of all do such things appear when we abuse the reputation of those who have treated us with special affection, after they have gone to the silent grave and cannot answer for themselves. We dislike to use language that would fitly characterize such conduct in the case of Eld. Canright. We could hardly have believed he would ever descend so low in his treatment of S.D. Adventists as to invade the cemetery, and dig up the dust and bones, figuratively speaking, of the honored pioneer of this denomination-the lamented Eld. James White, who for some six years has been peacefully sleeping from his ardent and sacrificing labors. The honor (?) of doing such work, so far as we have knowledge, since the old veteran's death, belongs wholly to Eld.C. He is entitled to all its benefits. We know of none who will desire to share it with him save the Christian (?) Oracle, of Des Moines, Iowa, which furnished him a fitting channel through which to pour out this stream of gall and bitterness upon the tomb. The fountain and channel are mutually appropriate to each other. We quote from this paper's issue of Aug.14,1887, from Eld. C.:-

"My first doubts were aroused by the tyrannical, domineering course of Eld. James White. Time and again I have seen a whole Conference sit for hours like whipped dogs, and take the most terrible denunciations from him. It made my blood boil; yet, like a coward, with the rest I dared not say a word, though we all knew it was unjust. As Mrs. White upheld him, generally, it led me to doubt her inspiration and the whole doctrine."

"In 1873 I spent a few weeks with Eld. White in Colorado. We had an open rupture, followed by a scathing 'testimony' from Mrs. White, which I knew to be untrue in many respects."

"But we soon made up, and I went on all right for years, with only a slight brush with Eld. White once or twice. But that was nothing peculiar to me, for there was not a leading man in the whole ranks with whom he did not some time have

0082

a quarrel, the same as with me. If there is such a man, let him speak out."

"Under date of Battle Creek, Mich., July 13. 1881, just a few weeks before he died, Eld. White wrote me thus: 'I have repeatedly abused you, and if you go to destruction, where many, to say the least, are willing you should go, I should ever feel I had taken part in your destruction.... I do not see how any man can labor with me.... Forgive my mistakes, and believe me when I say that every part of your long letter seems just and right.' Eld. White was a strong man, with some excellent qualities, and some very objectionable ones. Such humble confessions made to me by Eld. White, time and again, held me with them, when in my better judgement I knew things were not right."

These efforts to present the lamented Eld. White as a tyrant, domineering over everything, quarreling with all his fellow-laborers, dealing out "terrible denunciations" right and left, and putting the whole denomination in terror, so that a whole

Conference has sat "for hours like whipped dogs," Eld. Canright may think is a very creditable performance on his part. It shows the spirit and taste of the man when left to manifest his more unamiable traits, his coarser qualities, when driven on by that spirit which seems to take possession of those who give up God's truth. In other days he had friends to counsel with him, and save him from making an exposure of these unlovely qualities. But as he has cast these aside, he seems to have found none to fill their place. We pity him, and would advise his orthodox friends to step in and, if possible, save him from himself. teach him that which we supposed all persons of good breeding knew, to speak decently, at least, of the dead.

But in reference to Eld. White, we, as one of many who ever expect to revere his memory, denounce as a gross misrepresentation these statements. It is anything but a correct delineation of Eld. White's character and public life. He was not a quarrelsome man in any such sense as this term is usually understood. He was a man of strong feelings, very energetic, firm as a rock for what he thought was right, and one who dared to speak his mind when he thought duty required it. He was not turned aside easily in efforts he considered necessary for the good of the cause; and if his brethren stood in the way of such move, he expressed his mind plainly concerning their attitude. These qualities sometimes brought unpleasant

0083

things into public meetings, which were a source of sorrow to him and to others. He was a man of great forethought and ability to plan and execute, and was generally right in his plans and undertakings. But he was human, and consequently erring, as humanity always is, and sometimes made mistakes. But, as Eld. Canright is constrained to say, when he saw he was wrong, he was free to admit it and acknowledge it, even publicly. He was one of the noblest-hearted, most generous men in many things, I ever met, and as such had the confidence of our people and multitudes of friends who will ever revere his memory. Eld. White carried the heaviest kind of a burden in leading out, with his wife, in the early days of this movement. He had many hard and thankless duties to do, which wore upon his spirits and aged him prematurely. He had as many as four distinct shocks of paralysis, some of them so severe that his life was despaired of, and he came very near the brink of the grave. His friends could but notice the effects of these and the wear and tear of hard labor upon his nervous system, in his later years. These things made him

appear at times at a disadvantage. He got the reputation, with some persons of little consideration, of being irritable. But most of our brethren had sense and religion enough to make allowance for the old, stanch, earnest captain, fighting his Master's battles, who was so severely worn, and they did not store away every little incident which might for the time being seem a little unpleasant, to rankle in the the heart, to bring out on a favorable occasion with which to demean his memory. They have a high respect for him as a noble veteran in the cause of God. The citizens of Battle Creek, and many prominent men of the State of Michigan who know him, had a high regard for him. In a volume giving the biographies of leading men of Michigan who have left honored names because of their enterprise, ability, and sterling qualities, Eld. White has a very favorable place.

The writer had long and intimate acquaintance with him, and for many years was associated with him in labor, and sometimes we did not agree, and unpleasant things occurred. Yet I never saw the day but that I had a high regard for him as a man of many noble qualities, as an earnest Christian; and God forbid that I should ever follow Eld. Canright's course in publishing to the world such statements as he has made!

The fact is, Eld. White showed a special interest for Eld. C.

0084

He gave him a Bible and a pair of charts, and encouraged him to go into the ministry when he was little known among our people. He often took him to his house and treated him like a son. No doubt he did reprove him at times, and who shall say he did n't need it? Eld. C. appeared to think much of him. A little while before his death when Eld. C. married his present wife, Eld. White was the man who was wanted to "tie the knot." In the very words Eld. Can right quotes from his private letters just before his death, Eld. W. writes a tender confession to him. His heart was generous to a fault when he thought he had done a person a wrong. He is represented as asking Eld. C. to forgive his faults and mistakes. Eld. C. himself says, "He humbly owned up all I claimed with regard to his course." And now, kind reader, what do you think of the course Eld. Canright has pursued toward one who had treated him in such a way, and manifested toward him just before his death such a humble, Christian spirit? Do you think you would publish him to the world as a tyrant, quarrelsome, domineering, ill-tempered, lording it over God's heritage? Can you see anything to admire in such a course in the man who writes it or the paper which publishes it? We leave you to answer. These things would never have been done but for a miserable, vindictive, unchristian spirit cherished in the heart against the people from whom he has turned away.

We now notice his treatment of Mrs. White, who still lives. In regard to her he blows cold and hot by turns. At times she is one of the most devoted persons on earth, and earnest Christian, honest, benevolent, pure-minded, working unselfishly for humanity, a friend of the poor, and worthy of the highest respect. Then again she is an oppressor, a fanatic who never ought to be permitted to speak in a Christian pulpit, one who deceives the people, who he compares to Mohammed, Joe Smith, Ann Lee, etc., etc.

To a common person not given to lofty tumbling or the science of the acrobat, these two positions would seem irreconcilable. But lest the reader will think we misrepresent, we will quote from the Elder. In one of his public efforts "exposing" Adventism, in Otsego, Mich., last summer, Eld. W. C. Gage, of Battle Creek, Mich., was

present. He testifies as follows concerning the Elder's statements about Mrs. White: "He said the question would very naturally be asked if Mrs. White was a fraud or a bad woman. He was ready to reply

0085

at once that she was not; that she was as good a woman as he knew. Her piety was unquestioned, and as to ability he said there was not one woman in a thousand who was equal to her in point of natural ability and that which is acquired by cultivation. He said he had lived in her house and therefore was well acquainted with her. She was a kind-hearted woman, philanthropic, charitable, and gentle in her life, and ever evinced a great love for humanity. He stated that she was doubtless honest in supposing she had revelations from God, and really thought they came from that source, when in reality they were hallucinations of her own mind."

These statements of Eld. Gage are not given as the exact word he use, but express the substance of what he said concerning her character. They are literally true, as thousands of people not of our faith are willing to testify where she is know best. That Eld. C. should say so in view of his present feelings toward her, is positive proof of his knowledge that her character is unassailable. He would not be likely to say so in the presence of a public congregation, when he was about to ridicule her as he did, and do what he could to break down confidence in her work, unless she was generally known to be a woman of true excellence and Christian integrity. The favorable testimony of an enemy is the highest kind of evidence. And now let us hear on the other side of this question:-

"A people are to be pitied who are so narrow and bigoted that they cannot allow any one to be a Christian or even honest who does not see things just as they do. That is one of the worst features of Seventh-day Adventism. They get this from Mrs. White, who condemns everybody that dares to reject her testimonies. I know that this is so."- Canright in Christian Oracle of Aug. 4, 1887.

This statement as to S.D. Adventists and Mrs. White I know to be utterly untrue. There are thousands all around us not of our faith whom our people believe to be as honest Christians as ourselves, and Eld. C. knows it. Why do we not stop all or efforts to reach men who do not believe with us, if we think they are all dishonest? This is one of those extravagant statements the Elder so often makes. Mrs. Whites is one of the last persons to condemn those who do not embrace her testimonies. She always counsels the people to leave them perfectly free to investigate and decide for themselves, without bringing any pressure upon them. She

0086

does speak, however, against those who have believed them and known of them for years, who go out and misrepresent her and her work. But how can Mrs. White be at the same time such a pious, kind-hearted, devoted person, and yet so bigoted and unjust as to "condemn everybody" who dares to reject her testimonies? This is a conundrum we leave the Elder to solve.

In the Michigan Christian Advocate of Oct. 13, 1887, he shows his high appreciation of Mrs. White by comparing her with Ann Lee, Joseph Smith, Joanna Southcott, and others; and the work of S.D. Adventists with that of the Shakers, the Mormons, and followers of Mrs. Southcott. The comparison, in his judgment, seems greatly in favor of those impostors and fanatics, as he believes them all to be; while Mrs. White and the poor Adventists are far behind them in real success and spiritual power. Speaking of the Southcott movement, he says: "The present Seventh-day Adventist move is small and feeble compared to that. After forty-three years' effort they number less than one third as many." Speaking of the inspiration of the Mormons, he says: "The proof of their inspiration beats Mrs. Whites's all to pieces.... They have increased ten times as fast as the Adventists." Writing of Ann Lee, he says: "She exceeds Mrs. White in this line" (purity and holiness) "so that 'Shaker' has become a synonym for honesty." The despised Adventists, you see, are nowhere compared with those fanatics. This is from the man who stayed with them "twenty-eight years," and was so eminent among them, and felt so badly when he had to leave all his old friends! It almost killed the poor fellow to leave the society of such a set of narrow-minded fanatics! What a commentary on the the Elder's religious training ! And he tells us, "Since I was converted among the Methodists, thirty years ago, I have never once backslidden nor ceased an active Christian life either in private or public." Strange how he could keep his piety so immaculate in such a society that was really worse off than the Mormons and Shakers!

But to show his opinion of Mrs. White and her work, we will introduce the comparison he makes between her and her work and people, and Mrs. Southcott and her work. He says: "This movement, occurring only thirty years before Mrs. White's work, was almost exactly like the present Seventh-day Adventist move. An illiterate woman is the leader. She has visions, writes numerous pamphlets and revelations,

0087

predicts the speedy advent of Christ, and says the Jewish Sabbath must be kept," etc. Then in another place he speaks of Mrs. Southcott: "She regarded herself as the bride of the Lamb, and declared herself, when sixty-four years of age, pregnant with the true Messiah, the 'second Shiloh,' whom she would bear Oct. 19, 1814. She surrounded herself with prophets, and in order to prepare herself for the new dispensation ordered the strictest observance of the Jewish Sabbath. A costly cradle was kept in readiness for the reception of the Messiah, and for a long time she waited for his birth. At last a supposititious child was declared to be he. But the fraud was detected."

And this was the movement which the Elder declares over his own name "was almost exactly like the present Seventh-day Adventist movement." And this is the kind of an impression he is trying to give the world, of the people he has so thoroughly known for "twenty-eight years." He has been in the mill, and "knows all about them." What conclusion could strangers to our faith draw concerning Mrs. White and S.D. Adventists from such language? Almost exactly alike." Think of it, candid reader. Here was a woman who made the most ridiculous prediction possible, and tried her best to palm off a fraud to carry out her deceptions, and yet her work and that of Mrs. White are "almost exactly alike,; the difference being that the latter is really insignificant compared with that of Southcott! And yet in another place Mrs. White is an "honest, devoted Christian,"

one of the best he ever knew. What sort of wine of "Babylon" has our old acquaintance, D.M.C., been drinking since he left us, that his mind is so disordered? Yet he wonders we don't feel perfectly placid while he is "conscientiously" doing his duty to the world by making such statements and showing up our "fanatical" character.

We now present statements made by him concerning Mrs. White, in a handbill, in the city of Grand Rapids, Mich., when we were holding our camp-meeting there the last of September, 1887. His agents were sent upon the ground with thousands of these to circulate among the crowds on his "Sunday Lord's day," his new sacred day. This attack upon Mrs. White was wholly unprovoked by her.

He commences his attack upon her by this heading:-

"Mrs E.G. White to the Professed Christian Churches in Grand Rapids," and continues by quoting out of their

0088

connection sentences from her writings which he thinks he can make appear most objectionable. We give several specimens, as follows:-

"I saw the state of the different churches since the second angel proclaimed their fall. [1844.] They have been growing more and more corrupt; yet they bear the name of being Christ's followers. It is impossible to distinguish them from the world. Their ministers take their texts from the word, but preach smooth things.... Satan has taken full possession of the churches as a body. The sayings and doings of men are dwelt upon instead of the plain, cutting truths of the word of God.... They are Satan's own faithful servants, notwithstanding they have assumed another name. I saw that since Jesus had left the holy place of the heavenly Sanctuary [1844], and had entered within the second vail, the churches were left as were the Jews; and they have been filling up with every unclean and hateful bird. I saw great iniquity and vileness in the churches; yet they profess to be Christians. Their professions, their prayers, and their exhortations are an abomination in the sight of God. Said the angel, God will not dwell in their assemblies. Selfishness, fraud, and deceit are practiced by them without the reprovings of conscience. And over all these evil traits they throw the cloak of religion.... Jesus and the angel look upon them in anger. Said the angel, Their sins and their pride have reached unto heaven. Their portion is prepared. Justice and judgment have slumbered long, but will soon awake.'-Spiritual Gifts, vol.1, pp.189, 190, by

"MRS. E. G. WHITE, prophetess.

"The above quotations from Mrs. White show her attitude and that of her people toward all other churches and Christians. Every intelligent man knows it is an outrageous slander upon the Christian churches and Christian people of the land. If she had said that some bad men creep into churches and some churches tolerate them, it would do; but she makes the sweeping statement that 'Satan has taken full possession of the churches as a body,' and that they 'are filled with fornication and adultery, crime and murder.' Is this true? Is it anywhere near true? Is it not shamefully false? If these things were generally known, they would justly shut her out of every pulpit in the land.

"The people are invited to hear her at the camp-ground. Will they hear anything like that?-No, indeed. Her words

will be smoother than oil. These statements are made for her people to read. Scores of copies of them will be sold on the ground. If it is said that these quotations are garbled, let the books be called for and read. In public she preaches finely on popular subjects, as temperance, conversion, etc.; but to her people, writes as above. I have been through the mill, and know 'the true inwardness' of it. I repeat that she rules that people with a rod of iron, and meddles with the most private affairs of families and individuals."

That the reader may appreciate the animus of this attack, let him take in the situation. Mrs. White was a total stranger in Grand Rapids. She came there to talk wholly on religious themes, and benefit the people by teaching temperance and Bible religion. She had not spoken in any way publicly of Eld. Canright, and did not during her stay. She had treated him kindly, and like a son, in the past. Yet without one word of provocation from her, Eld. C. caused such a document to be circulated in every way possible among strangers, to rouse up the most uncharitable feelings. Is it any wonder that after waiting many months, during which he has been pouring out his bile through the papers, to go to all parts of the world, we should at last be compelled to expose such attacks as these after such outrageous treatment?

Let us notice the essential unfairness of this attack, and these quotations from her writings. They are taken, let the reader notice, from "Spiritual Gifts," vol.1, pp.189, 190. This volume was published in 1858. It presents a connected view of the "Great Controversy between Christ and Satan," commencing with the fall of Satan, presenting many incidents in the great plan of salvation and reaching down to the bringing in of the new heavens and new earth, long after the close of probation. This volume is not out of print. These extracts are taken from the chapter on the "Sins of Babylon," a period embraced in the view she presents reaching from 1844 to the close of probation. It is evident that she is speaking mainly of the time just before the coming of Christ takes place, when corruption will have completely permeated the great religious bodies. This is evident because this chapter is placed between two other chapters, the first headed, "The Shaking Time," and the other, "The Loud Cry." Any one who knows the views of Seventh-day Adventists is familiar with this fact, that they believe there is to be a "great shaking" out of half-hearted believer from the Advent body before the Lord will

mightily work for them, and prepare them for the "loud cry" of the Third Angels' Message of Rev.14:9-12. This "loud cry" just precedes the appearing of Christ, and we believe it is still future. The shaking time is mainly future also. Now this chapter on the "Sins of Babylon" is placed chronologically by the writer herself between these two, both of them future. Any candid mind can readily see that her terrible description of the state of things in the churches refers, therefore, largely to the future, though much that she says applies to the condition of things existing in them already. The strongest expressions, such as "Satan has taken full possession of the churches as bodies," most likely refer to them just before probation closes.

But in these very extracts, the most objectionable he could find in all her writings, she speaks of the condition of the churches as a progressive one toward evil, e.g., "The churches were left as were the Jews; and they have been filling up with every unclean and hateful bird." They were not filled up, but "filling" up. Here is a changing process going on as among the Jews. God in his mercy had long spared people after they had as a body rejected Christ's first advent. So after the churches as bodies reject the proclamation of his second advent, he bears with them while the process of corruption goes on apace.

In another column this matter is explained in an article on the "Fall of Babylon."

Notice now the manifest unfairness of Eld. Canright's attack on Mrs. White. To prejudice the people against her, he represents these statements of hers as applying at a time when he has every reason to know they do not apply, and then declares her statements to be "shamefully false," and states that they would justly "shut her out of every pulpit in the land." We leave the candid reader to decide who has been engaged in the work of falsehood.

Notice again how harmonious (?) are Eld. Canright's statements of Mrs. White. At one time she is "honest," a "devoted Christian," a humane, pure, noble-minded woman. Then again she makes statements "shamefully false," and is unworthy to be in any "pulpit in the land." Beautifully consistent, is it not?

We now cite one more statement of the Elder's concerning Mrs. W. It was printed in the Grand Rapids daily Democrat of Sept. 23, 1887, just before our camp-meeting commenced:-

0091

"She rules that people with a rod of iron, dictating in everything, in doctrine and discipline, in diet and dress, in public affairs and private, in marriage, in family matters, in everything." Then after quoting a sentence from her writings out of its connection, he adds: "Hence she meddles with the most private affairs of families, till, to a person of spirit, it becomes an intolerable bore." "To be ruled by a busybody is more than human nature can bear."-Macaulay.

This most malignantly false statement of Eld. Canright we will let the Elder himself answer. In a series of articles written by Eld. Canright, and published in the REVIEW AND HERALD, entitled a "Plain Talk to Murmurers," commencing March 15, 1877, he says concerning the same woman: "As to the Christian character of sister White, I beg leave to say that I know something about it. I have been acquainted with sister White for eighteen years, more than half the history of our people. I have been in their family time and again, sometimes weeks at a time. They have been in our house and family many times. I have traveled with them almost every where; have been with them in private and public; in meeting and out of meeting; and have had the very best chance to know something of the life, character, and spirit of brother and sister White. As a minister, I have to deal with all kinds of persons, and all kinds of characters, till I can judge something of what a person is, at least, after years of intimate acquaintance. I know sister White to be an unassuming modest, kind-hearted, noble woman. These traits in her character are not simply put on and cultivated, but they spring gracefully and easily from the natural disposition. She is not self-conceited, self-righteous, and self-important, as fanatics always are. I have frequently come in contact with fanatical persons, and I

have always found them to be full of pretensions, full of pride, ready to give their opinion boastfully of their holiness, etc. But I have ever found sister White the reverse of all this. Any one of the poorest and humblest can go to her freely for advice and comfort without being repulsed. She is ever looking after the needy, the destitute, and the suffering, providing for them and pleading their cause. I have never formed an acquaintance with any person who so constantly has the fear of God before them. Nothing is undertaken without earnest prayer to God. She studies God's word carefully and constantly.

"I have heard sister White speak hundreds of times, have

0092

read all her 'Testimonies' through and through, most of them many times, and I have never been able to find one immoral sentence in the whole of them, or anything that is not strictly pure and Christian, nothing that leads away from the Bible or Christ; but there I find the most earnest appeals to obey God, to love Jesus, to believe the Scriptures, and to search them constantly. I have received great spiritual benefit, times without number, from the 'Testimonies.'" "If I have any judgment, any spiritual discernment, I pronounce of 'Testimonies' to be of the same spirit and of the same tenor as the Scriptures." "For thirty years these 'Testimonies' have been believed and read by our people. How has it affected them? Has it led them away from the law of God? Has it led them to give up faith in Christ? Has it led them to throw aside the Bible? Has it led them to be a corrupt and immoral people? I know that they will compare favorably with any other Christian denomination. One thing I have remarked, and that is that the most bitter opponents of the visions admit that she is a Christian. How they can make this admission is more than I know. They try to fix it up by saying that she is deceived. They are not able to put their finger upon a single stain in all her life, or an immoral sentence in all her writings. They have to admit that much of her writings is excellent, and that whoever would live out all she says would be a good Christian, sure of heaven. This is passing strange if she is a tool of the Devil, inspired of Satan, or if her writings are immoral or the vagaries of her own mind.

We do not cite these passages from the Elder's writings to convince any one that these "Testimonies" are inspired. This is not our object, but merely to let the reader see what kind of a woman Mrs. White was in the Elder's estimation after such an intimate acquaintance with her for "eighteen years." But did he not change his mind soon after this? Did he not come to believe Mrs. White's writings were evil and she a meddlesome, tyrannical fanatic as he now claims?

We answer this question by referring the reader to Eld. Canright's Confession, published originally in the REVIEW AND HERALD of Oct. 7, 1884, and now reprinted in these pages. This confession was made only about three years since, and Eld. C. himself will not claim Mrs. White's character has changed since then.

Is it not astonishing that a man of his parts can change about with such recklessness, in so short a time, that he

0093

dares to place statements so utterly contradictory before the great public? No man can reconcile these statements. Was he telling the truth about Mrs. White when he was among us? Thousands of us know those earlier statements are literally true. Many eminent citizens of Battle Creek and other places where she is best known, not of our faith, would testify to the same effect. The leading citizens of Battle Creek, the prominent business men of the place, arranged a meeting for her to speak on some subject of her own choosing, and publicly invited her in the Daily Journal to do so at her recent visit here after the Grand Rapids camp-meeting. She complied and spoke to a large congregation. The Adventists had nothing to do in bringing this about. This shows clearly whether she is considered a "fanatic," or one unworthy to speak in any "pulpit" or not. The following notice of the meeting appeared in the Battle Creek Journal of Oct. 5:-

"There was a good attendance, including a large number of our most prominent people, at the lecture of Mrs. Ellen G. White, at the Tabernacle, last evening.

"This lady gave her audience a most eloquent discourse, which was listened to with marked interest and attention. Her talk was interspersed with instructive facts which she had gathered in her recent visit to foreign lands, and demonstrated that this gifted lady has, in addition to her many other rare qualifications, a great faculty for attentive, careful observation, and a remarkable memory of details. This, together with her fine delivery and her faculty of clothing her ideas in choice, beautiful, and appropriate language, made her lecture one of the best that has ever been delivered by any lady in our city. That she may soon favor our community with an other address, is the earnest wish of all who attended last evening; and should she do so, there will be a large attendance."

We now bring this article to a close. If Eld. Canright told the truth about her, as we know he did, in years past, he certainly is not telling truth in his recent statements. If he was telling falsehoods then, how can we believe his present statements? We leave him to solve this enigma.

G. I. B.

0094

CONFESSION OF ELD. CANRIGHT.

THE following article from Eld. Canright, referred to on page 92, was published in the Review of Oct. 7, 1884, under the heading, "To my Brethren, the S.D. Adventists:"-

"Most of the readers of the REVIEW know the part which I have acted in the cause for many years, both in preaching and in writing. They also know that for two years past I have dropped out of the work. I wish here to state why this so. Some twelve years ago I received a testimony from Sr. White. I felt that it was too severe, and that some of it was not true. Instead of holding on to my faith in the work and to God, and waiting for him to make it clear, I became tried, and quit preaching a short time. But I soon got mostly over this, and went to work again, though I did not feel exactly right toward Sr. White, nor fully accept all the testimony.

"Some five years since, I received another testimony while under great discouragement. This I did not receive at all well, but felt hard toward Sr. White, and

soon quit the work entirely. But I found no comfort that way, and so, after a short time, went to preaching again. Still I was not heartily in sympathy with all parts of the work, especially the 'Testimonies.' I thought I would preach practical truth largely, and as much of the message as I liked; but this did not work, as the brethren were not satisfied, neither was I. So I went to farming, resolved to live a devoted life, and to do all I could that way. But I soon found my doubts and fears increasing, and my devotion decreasing, till, at length, I found myself largely swallowed up in my work, with little time, taste, or interest for religious work. I felt sure the 'Testimonies' were not reliable, and that other views held by our people were not correct. So it always is when a person lets go of one point of the truth,-he begins to drift, he knows not whither.

"A short time since, I attended the Northern Michigan camp-meeting with Eld. Butler. Here we had a long time for consultation, prayer, and careful examination of my difficulties. I began to see that at least some of my objections were not tenable, and that I myself was not right and in the light. Coming to the Jackson camp-meeting, we continued the investigation, and carefully read over and examined my testimonies. I saw that I had put a wrong meaning on some things, and that other things were certainly true. If these

0095

were true, then I had certainly been wrong all the way through. Light came into my mind, and for the first time in years I could truly say I believed the 'Testimonies.' All my hard feelings toward Sr. White vanished in a moment, and I felt a tender love toward her. Everything looked different. Then I felt how wrong, sinful, and in the dark I had been. My sins came up before me as never before in all my life. Like Job I cried, 'Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes.'

"I deeply feel that in my past labors I have lacked in spirituality, humility, and a close walk with God. I have often been too hasty and harsh in my labors. I will never rest till all this is changed, and I become a tender-hearted, devoted shepherd of the flock. I will submit to any humiliation, shame, or cross that will fit me to win souls to Christ. I think that my disbelief to the 'Testimonies' and other truths has come by opening my heart to doubts, cherishing them and magnifying them. How many times I, like others, have solemnly professed my unbounded faith in the Third Angel's Message! Is it not reasonable that God should try us in some way to see whether our faith is real and genuine? A faith that cannot stand under some difficulties, that cannot hold on to great facts and truths against some apparent objections, that cannot remember bright experiences, while going through dark places,-such a faith is not a reliable one. If God really has a great and special message to be given, is it not reasonable that the faith of his people, especially those who are chosen to bear that message, should be tried? Surely it is just what we might expect.

"Looking back to similar movements in God's work, we find that his people were always thus tested. When God led Israel out of Egypt, after he had given them marked proof of his presence among them, then he allowed adverse circumstances to come upon them to try their faith. Deut.8:1-3. How did they stand this test? Many of them immediately cried out, 'Is God among us or not?' Ex.17:7. So Jesus, likewise, tested the faith of his early disciples. In the first part of John 6, Jesus wrought the miracle of

feeding the five thousand. So profoundly impressed were they by this miracle that they rose up to make him king right there. On the next day, when Jesus taught them some very cutting truths, they said, 'This is an hard saying; who can hear it?' Verse 60. 'From that time many of his disciples went back, and

0096

walked no more with him.' Verse 66. Though they had had so plain evidence that God was with him, yet when something was presented which looked very objectionable to them, their faith failed, and they backslid and left the party.

"I am now thoroughly satisfied that the work of the Third Angel's Message is no exception to this rule, but that our strong professions of faith in it will sooner or later be tested severely. How many times I have publicly and solemnly professed my unbounded confidence in this truth! How clear and connected, how marvelously beautiful, the whole system looked to me! How confident I felt that the Bible overwhelmingly sustained it, and that I would even die for it! But, like Peter, I did not know myself till God left me to be tried. I feel greatly humbled under the shameful failure I have made.

"Friday, Sept. 26, while on the camp-ground at Jackson, Mich, I felt in my heart the most remarkable change that I ever experienced in all my life. It was a complete reversion of all my feelings. Light and faith came into my soul, and I felt that God had given me another heart. I never felt such a change before, not even when first converted, not when I embraced the message, nor at any other time. I believe it was directly from Heaven-the work of the Spirit of God. I now believe the message as firmly and more understandingly than ever before; and I want to say to all my friends everywhere, that now I not only accept, but believe, the 'Testimonies' to be from God. Knowing the opposition I have felt to them, this change in my feelings is more amazing to myself than it can be to others.

"Such nearness to God, such earnest devotion, such solemn appeals to live a holy life can only be prompted by the Spirit of God. Where that is, there I want to be. I am fully satisfied that my own salvation and usefulness in saving others depend upon my being connected with this people and this work. And here I take my stand, to risk all I am, or have, or hope for, in this life to come, with this people and this work.

D.M. CANRIGHT."

TANNING A MUSQUITO'S HIDE

ELD. CANRIGHT likens Seventh-day Adventists to men on the shore tanning a musquito's hide, while the crew is perishing in the water before their eyes. In the Advocate of Aug 13, 1887 he says:-

0097

Jacob Knapp, in rebuking hair-splitting theologians, said: "It is not God, but the Devil, who sets men tanning a musquito's hide on shore, while a shipwrecked crew are

perishing unhelped before them." There is a volume of sense in that homely remark. It well illustrates the work of the seventh-day people. They will compass sea and land, and turn the world upside down to get one good old Christian to rest on Saturday and work on Sunday. while thousands of lost souls are dying all around them, uncared for. How much better to assist in the great work of leading sinners to Christ, instead of hindering those who are doing it!

What has seemed to be Eld. C.'s principal work since his new departure?- Exposing Adventism. Now we submit to the reader to decide whether it is any worse to spend one's time tanning a musquito's hide, that it is to spend it fighting the men who are tanning the musquito's hide, while the crew is perishing just the same all the while. From what he said we supposed we should behold in him the sublime spectacle of a man avoiding all strife on controverted points, and devoting himself to the work, pure and simple, of saving souls. But such does not seem to be the case to any marked degree.

He admits that the seventh-day church is a good, devoted, Christian church; and he claims to have brought a thousand into that church during his twenty-two years' ministry. That averages about fifty a year. Does he think he could have done any better in any other Christian church? or that he will do any better in the future? Do ministers generally average more than fifty converts each a year, for twenty years in succession? Then has he not, as a Seventh-day Adventist, brought as many souls to Christ during this time as he would have done in any other connection?

But he may say, Some of these were brought from other churches. Very well; he seems more anxious now to get all people out of this good Christian S.D.A. church into other churches, than ever he did to get people out of other churches into this. In what respect is his present position, therefore, preferable to his first?

U.S.

0098

ALL THINGS TO ALL MEN

We notice quite a difference in the tone of Eld. C.'s arguments, according to the views of the paper for which he writes. Thus, while writing for the Methodist paper, the organ of a denomination which has strenuously maintained the unceasing obligation of the ten commandments, he says:-

P.S.: Lest my position should be misunderstood before I have time to explain it, I will say here that I believe as strongly as Sabbatarians do in the perpetuity of the holy immutable law of God, and every moral precept taught in the Old Testament. The Methodist Discipline (Articles of Religion, sect. 6) exactly expresses my position on the law: "Although the law given from God by Moses as touching ceremonies and rites, doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity be received in any commonwealth; yet, notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral."-Advocate, Sept. 24, 1887.

Now he knows, as all know, that the Methodist Discipline by the expression, "the commandments which are called moral," means the decalogue, the ten commandments, as they were spoken by God from Sinai, and written on the tables of stone. So the

Methodists will get the idea that Eld. C. agrees with them in this, and so be much pleased. But when he is writing to an Antinomian paper, as the Christian Oracle, of Des Moines, Iowa, instead of saying what is to be understood that no Christian whatsoever is free from obedience to the decalogue, he says that all Christians are free from it; for it has been nailed to the cross, and taken out of the way. Thus in the Oracle of June 9, 1887, we read the following from his pen:-

The simple facts, I believe, are these: Paul [in Col.2:14-17] refers to the entire Jewish system, the law of Moses as a whole, of which the decalogue was only a small part. Every word of the ten commandments, Sabbath included, was written by the hand of Moses, on parchment, right in with the rest of the law of Moses. (See Duet.5, and other places.) As an entire system, as a law taken in all its parts, it was a burdensome system, a yoke of bondage, a school master designed only to lead us to Christ. It was against us and contrary to us, and as such it was nailed to the cross. The decalogue being written

0099

on parchment in the book of the law, it would be proper to speak of it as blotted out, nailed to the cross, etc., with the rest of the law.

Eld. C. would not dare address such language to the Methodist Advocate. If he did, it would not be published. This is being all things to all men with a vengeance.

U.S.

"THE SHUT DOOR."

PERHAPS there is no point upon which opposers of S.D. Adventists and Mrs. White try harder, to cast an unfavorable impression, than that of the "shut door." They strenuously endeavor to make it appear that S.D. Adventists, from 1845 to about 1851, believed there was no salvation for sinners; that the "door of mercy" was eternally closed, and not a soul, except those who had believed the advent doctrine with Mr. Miller and his followers, could by any possibility be saved. They try their best to make this statement stand against Mrs. White and her husband, and declare positively that this is taught in her visions. Eld. Canright must, of course, rehash this old exploded falsehood, or he would not have a good standing with the other worthies who have propagated it. Hear him, in the Michigan Christian Advocate of October 13, 1887:-

"The shut door. After the time passed in 1844, Seventh-day Adventists believed that probation had ended, that there was no more salvation for sinners. Eld. Butler confesses that this is so. (See REVIEW AND HERALD, March 3, 1885.) Mrs. White believed this, and had a revelation saying so, and here it is: 'The reformations that were shown me, were not reformations from error to truth, but from bad to worse; for those who professed a change of heart had only wrapped about them a religious garb, which covered up the iniquity of a wicked heart. Some appeared to have been really converted so as to deceive God's people, but if their hearts could be seen they would appear as black as ever. My accompanying angel bade me look for the travail of soul for sinners as used

to be. I looked, but could not see it, for the time for their salvation is past.'-Present Truth, page 22, published in August, 1849. They may quibble over this till they die, but there it stands against her, plain enough to any candid man."

In the above notice is the expression, "After the time passed

0100

in 1844, Seventh-day Adventists believed that probation had ended, that there was no more salvation for sinners. Eld. Butler confesses that this is so." Eld. Butler "confesses" no such thing. The deceptiveness of the statement will appear when we state that there was not an S.D. Adventist in the world in 1844. The present movement had not commenced till some time after that. We do not deny that many of the Advent believers, when the time passed, did believe their work for sinners was done for some little time, and that some who afterward began to keep the Sabbath participated in this view for a season. There was quite a space of time after that before the present move was inaugurated. Several years passed before the believers was fully acquainted with the views held now,-years of patient study of the Bible till the truth was grasped link by link. So S.D. Adventists cannot be made responsible for views held before this denomination existed, or the present truth was developed.

We will go a step farther, and say, S.D. Adventists did hold to a doctrine called the "shut door." They believed, in harmony with Rev.3:7,8, and other scriptures, that at the close of the long prophetic period of 2300 years of Dan.8:14, Christ changed his ministration from the first apartment of the heavenly Sanctuary to the most holy place, and entered upon the work of the investigative Judgment, changing his relation in this respect to the plan of salvation. Here was a door opened and a door shut. Their work then was very unpopular, and they were shut away by this fact from any in labor, but Advent believers. But we do emphatically deny that S.D. Adventists or Mrs. White believed that any repentant sinner who would come to Christ would be refused. It is a slander to say the contrary. We also declare, with no fears of contradiction, that during his very period when Eld. D. and other opposers of the same ilk teach that she and others believed there was no salvation for sinners, she and they were laboring for the conversion of sinners. Hence their statements cannot be true.

In 1885 the writer, who was a youth at the passing of the time in 1844, and quite well acquainted with the Advent people, wrote a series of articles for the REVIEW AND HERALD\ on the "Advent Experience" and the shut door, in which all these charges were thoroughly sifted and answered. To give the reader some idea of the conclusions reached, we will give the concluding article, No. 9, of the series:-

In No. 8 we gave extracts showing that what is called the "shut door" doctrine was held by the believers in 1850-51. But we also clearly proved that it excluded only those who rejected the light. We quoted from Eld. White's language the very strongest expressions which our opponents can find by

0101

which they try to make it appear that it was thought that none but the believers in '44 could be saved. We have seen how utterly they have failed to prove their position. We

will now present other evidences confirming our statements. On page 72 of \Present Truth, published in Oswego, N.Y., April, 1850, we have the following item:-

A very interesting work is now going on among the children of the "remnant" in this city. Their salvation has been the principal subject in our meetings for the last two Sabbaths, and God has wonderfully blessed us. The truth has had a good effect on us as well as on our children. In the evening following the last first day we had a meeting for their special benefit, and the Spirit of the Lord was poured out in our midst. The children all bowed before the Lord, and seemed to feel the importance of keeping the commandments, especially the fifth, and of seeking salvation through Jesus Christ. This was one of the most interesting meetings that I ever witnessed.

As this seems to be editorial matter (for there is no signature to it), it must have been from the pen of Eld. White. This was published just one month before the article containing the lengthy extract from his pen which we quoted last week, and which contains those strong statements about the shut door, which opposers say prove that he believed there was no salvation for anybody but old Advent believers. Here we see him laboring, no doubt in connection with his wife, with the deepest interest for the dear children who were "seeking salvation." God greatly blessed them in their efforts. This had been their principal work for two weeks. It had been a great blessing to them and their children. Yet our opponents conclude from what he published a month later, that they believed none of these children could be saved because they were not believers in '44. They were laboring with all their might for the salvation of those who they thought could not be saved! This may be their conclusion, but certainly it is not ours. We know, therefore, that they held no such views of the shut door as opposers attribute to them.

In the November number of Present Truth, pages 84, 85, we have an account of the conversion of young persons, and the baptism of one who must have been young to have been a believe in 1844. This passage occurs in a letter of S.W. Rhodes's, who was a prominent laborer at that time, and shows what kind of a shut door they believed in.

On the last page of the last number of Present Truth, in a letter from Eld. Joseph Bates, we find the following: "Our meeting at Waitsfield was blessed of God. Bro. and Sr. Butler came from Waterbury with Brn. Chamberlain and Churchill; Brn. Hart and Bailey came from Northfield; and those in the place, with Bro. Lockwood's family, composed our meeting. Bro. Butler finally yielded to the truth."

We personally remember this time as though it were but yesterday,

0102

although it was in 1850. Mother had been keeping the Sabbath about a year. Father was much opposed to it, though a strong believer in the great Advent movement of the past. The light on the Sanctuary subject brought him to accept the seventh-day Sabbath. We notice this meeting because the name of Bro. Churchill is mentioned. His was one of the very first cases of conversion from the world to the present truth, which occurred after 1844. As we have said, their work hitherto had been almost wholly for the "lost sheep of the house of Israel"-the old Advent believers. They saw that unbelievers showed no interest in the truths which were so precious to them, and therefore their attention was directed to those who loved the Advent faith, and they labored ardently for them. This evidently, was in the order of God. Heman Churchill. of Stowe, Vt., the one here

mentioned, had not been engaged in the Advent movement of 1844. He had married, after this, a daughter of Sr. Benson, a '44 Adventist. I remember him well as he came to Waterbury, Vt., and attended meeting in my father's house, where a few met from time to time. They were quite surprised at first that one who had been an unbeliever should manifest an interest in the Advent doctrine. He was not repulsed, but welcomed. He was earnest and zealous; and as they discerned in him sincerity, they accepted him as a true convert. I cannot remember the exact date when he commenced to seek God, though I recollect clearly his attending meetings at Waterbury, Vt. But we know from this letter of Eld. Bates's, that it was previous to this meeting held in the fall of 1850; for he was then at the meeting referred to in Waitsfield, Vt., as a believer. Bro. Bates calls him "Brother." His conversion was noised abroad quite extensively. Now, if our opponents were correct in their statements that the believers held to a shut door which entirely excluded all except old Adventists, how could Heman Churchill have been received as a true convert? This is positive evidence that their assertions are untrue. There is not an instance which can be found in the early history of this cause where any one manifesting sincerity in seeking God was ever repulsed. They were most glad of any evidence that such desired the blessing of God!

In a letter recently received from Bro. Ira Abbey, of north Brookfield, N.Y., whose name is signed to the statement at the close of this article, I take the liberty of making the following extract:-

After the time passed I was a strong shut door believer. But when the Third Angel's Message was preached, I with my wife embraced it. Between 1846 and 1850 Bro. and Sr. White came to our house, and were very zealous for the children and those that had not rejected the truth. They labored for unconverted souls, and never do I remember of hearing Sr. White say that there were no hopes of the unconverted: but there were hopes of the backsliders and those that had not rejected the truth.

0103

This is an extract from a private letter, and was not written for publication; but the testimony is so clear we venture to insert it.

We next present and extract from a statement written by Marion C. Truesdail, and signed by herself and five others:-

During Miss Harmon's (now Mrs. White) visit to Paris, Me., in the summer of 1845, I stated to her the particulars of a dear friend of mine whose father had prevented her attending meetings; consequently she had not rejected light. She smilingly replied, "God never has shown me that there is no salvation for such persons. It is only those who have had the light of truth presented to them and knowingly rejected it." Miss Harmon's reply coincided with my idea of a shut door, and in justice no other could be derived from it.

The fact here presented is certainly a decisive one as to the nature of the shut door in which they believed, even as early as 1845.

We now present a very explicit and comprehensive statement covering this whole shut door experiences, of believers in the Third Angel's Message previous to the year 1851. There are a goodly number of living witnesses who embraced the truth at that early date, who know whether these statements are true or not. Why should not their

testimony be considered in this connection? We have obtained the signatures of quite a number, all of whom embraced the truth as early as 1850, and all were in the '44 movement:-

We, the undersigned, having been well acquainted with the Advent movement in 1844 at the passing of the time, and having also embraced the truths of the Third Angel's Message as early as 1850, hereby cheerfully subscribe our names to the following statement concerning the shut door doctrine held by believers in the Third angel's Message from the time of its rise to the last-mentioned date, and onward.

They believed, in harmony with Rev.3:7,8, and other scriptures, that at the close of the 2300 days of Dan.8:14 Christ closed his work in the first apartment of the heavenly Sanctuary, and changed his ministration to the most holy, and entered upon the work of the Judgment, changing his relation in this respect to the plan of salvation. Here was a door opened and a door shut.

They believed that those who had the clear light upon the First Angel's Message and turned against it, bitterly opposing it, were rejected of God. But they did not believe that those who had not had the light or those who had not come to years of accountability previous to 1844, if they should seek God with honest hearts, would be rejected.

While they believed with William Miller and the great mass of

Adventists immediately after the passing of the time, that their work for the world was done, and that the Lord would come very soon, yet after the light upon the Sanctuary and the third message explained their disappointment, they did not believe that mercy was past save for those who had rejected the light.

J.B. Sweet,	South Saginaw, Mich.
Samuel Martin,	West Rindge, N.H.
Ira Abbey,	North Brookfield, N.Y.
Mrs. R.B. Abbey,	North Brookfield, N.Y.
Mrs. Diana Abbey,	North Brookfield, N.Y.
Mrs. L.B. Abbey,	North Brookfield, N.Y.

0104

Heman S. Gurney,	Memphis, Mich.
Ann E. Gurney,	Memphis, Mich.
Wm. Gifford,	Memphis, Mich.
Mrs. Mary S. Chase,	Battle Creek, Mich.
Mrs. S.M. Howland,	Battle Creek, Mich.
Mrs. F.H. Lunt,	Battle Creek, Mich.
Mrs. Melora A. Ashley,	Battle Creek, Mich.
Mrs. Caroline A. Dodge,	Battle Creek, Mich.
Mrs. Sarah B. Whipple,	Battle Creek, Mich.
Mrs. Uriah Smith,	Battle Creek, Mich.
Mrs. Paulina R. Heligass,	Moline, Kan.
R.G. Lockwood.	St. Helena, Cal.
Mrs. R.G. Lockwood	St. Helena, Cal.
Reuben Loveland,	North Hyde Park, Vt.

Mrs. Belinda Loveland,

North Hyde Park, Vt.

Here is an argument which it will be hard to answer,-more than a score of living witnesses testifying clearly and emphatically to what they know concerning the shut door doctrine. On the other hand, our opponents who raise such a hue and cry about the shut door had no practical knowledge of the matter. They were not in the movement themselves, and they have obtained at second hand what knowledge they have concerning it, while the witnesses we have quoted were actors in the message, and know whereof they affirm. We have demonstrated beyond all question that our opponents accuse the early believers falsely when they say they taught there was no salvation save for those who were Advent believers previous to 1844.

These persons are every one living, and most of them reside at the same places here given. Eld. Canright knows most of them, and we venture the assertion that he will not impugn the testimony or truthfulness of one of them. Every one of them had the statement preceding their signatures, and carefully considered its contents. Are these statements not worthy of as much confidence as those of persons who never knew anything whatever of the circumstances personally? Let the reader judge. We know whereof we affirm.

Mrs. White's statement, quoted by Eld. C. at the head of this article, relates, as the connection shows, to characteristics of many modern revivals led by men who had rejected the light. There was not the travail of soul for sinners with them but a light, frivolous, frothy spirit, such as is often seen in modern revivals. Our time has been cursed with such. Such revivals have little of the deep searchings of heart seen among the early Methodists and Baptists. We pity the man who cannot see the difference. The men who led in such revivals had rejected the light, and God rejected them. The time of "their salvation" was "past." This is what she has always said she meant in this statement. This is precisely in harmony with her actions in laboring for sinners, as we have seen, at the very time in which these opposers say she did not believe they could

0105

be saved. This is what these twenty-one unchallenged, truthful, living witnesses positively declare from their own knowledge was true. Shall we take Eld. Canright's declarations about something he had no knowledge of whatever, in preference to theirs? Let those take it who prefer it.

Let the reader further notice that Mrs. White's language quoted above does not necessarily include all revivals by any means. "The reformations that were shown me." she says. This is far from saying that all reformations would be of this character. The fair interpretation of her words would simply imply that she was shown a peculiar phase of things in the religious world characteristic of the last days, the superficial nature of many so-called revivals of religion. They are indeed a wonderful evidence of the nearness of the end.

They are fast filling up the churches with unconverted people. All intelligent observers notice this as an astonishing thing. Mrs. White pointed this out in 1849. We now see its fulfillment.

G.I.B.

THAT GOOD CHARACTER ELD. BUTLER GAVE HIM.

We refer to a brief extract which Eld. Canright has quoted over and over again, from an article by the writer in REVIEW of March 22, 1887. The quotation is as follows: "In leaving us he has taken a much more manly and commendable course than most of those who have withdrawn from us, coming voluntarily to our leading brethren and frankly stating the condition of mind he was in. He did this before his own church in our presence, and so far as we know has taken no unfair, underhanded means to injure us in any way. He goes from our midst with no immoral stain upon his character, and chooses associations more pleasant to himself. This is every man's personal privilege if he chooses to take it."

The Elder evidently finds much satisfaction in this simple statement, quoting it, as he does, so often. He evidently thinks the writer's indorsement to the extent given, very valuable. We suppose he feels his need of something of the kind, or he would not make so much of it. We greatly fear, however, that he has forfeited by his course since even as much of a character for fairness, justice, or righteousness as this would seem to give him.

We wrote that statement in the interests of peace and good will, and in view of the oft-repeated promises of the Elder

0106

that he would do nothing whatever to tear down our work. When he wrote to us that he was receiving letters from private persons censuring him and imputing evil motives, hurting his feelings, etc., we wrote the article containing the above, hoping to allay all feelings of hostility among our people. This was but a few weeks after he left us. He had not then commenced his bitter raid upon us through the pulpit and press. We truly desired, on our part, to have nothing done to stir up strife. We wished to give him the best chance possible to carry out his oft-repeated statement that he should confine himself wholly to revival and church work, and seek alone to save souls. Had he done so, this pamphlet would never have seen the light of day. We should not have disturbed him or hindered him.

The writing of the article containing this extract is one of the strongest possible evidences that his oft-repeated statement that S.D. Adventists will never permit one to leave them in peace is untrue. Why should the writer, holding the position he does in this cause, pen such an article in our leading paper, speaking in this kindly manner of Eld. Canright after he had fully left us and joined another church, urging our people to give him kind treatment and not impugn his motives of stir him up in any way, unless we had sincerely desired to treat him well? We thus showed our desire to let him depart in peace is untrue. He alone is responsible for the controversy which has ensued. Of course he knows full well that his use of this good-character extract in the way he has used it, and under the changed circumstances of the case, is a perversion of its original intent; that in justice he has no right to it since he has been doing as he has, utterly contrary to the circumstances under which it was given. But the Elder never lets such considerations

stop him in any cherished purpose. He fails to manifest that fine sense of honor which we should expect to see in some men. On the whole, we do not regret that we cultivated peaceable relations with him when he left us. This fact only makes his own course seem the more reprehensible.

G.I.B.

0107

PERSONAL

CONSIDERABLE handle, I understand, is being made in some directions, of the fact that the editor of the REVIEW has been troubled over the question of the visions, has been unsound on that question, and at one time came very near giving them up. It strikes me that this is quite a small amount of capital to work up much of a trade on-"came very near giving them up"- but didn't! I also, at one time, came very near getting run over by the cars, and rolled into jelly; but I didn't, and so continue to this day. Some have met just such a catastrophe. The difference between them and myself is that they did, and I didn't. Some have given up the visions. The difference between them and myself is the same-they did, and I didn't .

Just how near I ever did come to giving them up, I am willing any one should know who wishes to know, if it can be determined. Perhaps I have not come so near as some suppose; perhaps not so near as I have supposed myself. That I have had, in my experience, occasional periods of trial, I do not deny. There have been times when circumstances seemed very perplexing; when the way to harmonize apparently conflicting views, did not at once appear. And under what have seemed, for the time, strong, provocations to withdraw from the work, I have canvassed the question how far this could reasonable be done, or how much of this work could consistently be surrendered. I have pondered the questions whether this point was not inconsistent, or that absurd, or the other out of harmony with reason and revelation; and whether this feature ought not to be re-adjusted, or the other set aside entirely. All this ground I have gone over as thoroughly as any one of no more ability than myself could go, and with as great a degree of candor as any one in as much darkness as I was in, would be likely to maintain. But the weight of evidence has never in my mind balanced on the side of surrender.

This I can say, that never, since I became fully acquainted with that system which we denominate "the present truth," so as to comprehend it in its sublime proportions, its divine harmony, and its inseparable connections, have I had the least shadow of misgiving as to its truthfulness in its fundamental principles, and its stability and final triumph, as the work of God. It is evident, also, that this work before its close must present the fulfillment of the prophecy of Joel, and some prophecies of the book of Revelation. And to whatever degree I may have persuaded myself that this cause might have been so far developed without this feature which we call the gift of prophecy, it was only to look for something of the kind to appear in the future; for without this, it would lack one of the tests of being the work of the last generation.

This was not the phase of the question, however, with which we had to deal. For here was a manifestation which had been interwoven with this cause from its very commencement; and the idea of separating this feature from it now, in the present stage of the work, is very different from the question of how things might have been if no such feature had yet been connected with it. A little reflection is sufficient to show that the message, and this which purports to be one of the gifts of the Spirit which has accompanied it, cannot be separated.

Well, then, says one, the absurdity of this part of the work is sufficient to overthrow the other. To which I reply, No; for the strength of the other part is sufficient to hold a person from giving up this. And this has been the position I have occupied. And so whatever doubts and perplexities I have had, I have in reality come just as near giving up the visions as I have of surrendering other parts of the message from which this could not be separated, and respecting which I have never had a misgiving.

It has never seemed to me the part of wisdom to fix the mind upon any one point to the exclusion of all the rest, and let a difficulty there distract the view from everything else, and override every other consideration, and then because everything was not clear right as that point, to make an impulsive and rash plunge which would lead to the surrender of other points which one did not anticipate, and which he did not desire to surrender. It has seemed to me the better way to consider the question in all its bearings, not the effects which would be produced, take in the consequences, and not make a move till one was prepared to accept the results which it was foreseen would probably or inevitably follow. Upon this principle I have tried to act. And I have never seen the time when I was willing to accept the results of a denial of the position and calling of sister White in connection with this cause, and hence have never seen the time when I have said by word of mouth, or come to a decision in my own heart, that her visions were not the operation of the Spirit of God.

Of the admonitions and reproofs I have needed my full share; and whenever anything of this nature has come which I could not understand, or circumstances have arisen which seemed inexplicable, I have been content to wait, knowing that the foundation of God standeth sure, to see what solution of difficulties a little time would accomplish. The beautiful sentiment of the hymn has often come to my mind both as a caution and a prophecy:-

"Soon shall our doubts and fears
All yield to Thy control;
Thy tender mercies shall illumine
The midnight of the soul."

A general in battle does not despair of his army while the center stands firm. The wings may waver; there may be some confusion on the outskirts; but while the center holds, the battle is not lost. So with the present truth; so long as the main pillars remain unshaken, it is folly to leave the building as if it was about to fall.

Some of our brethren, I understand, who do not indorse the visions, knowing that I have questioned the arguments based on some scriptures in their behalf (only one or two, however have thought me hypocritical because I did not come out and controvert in the REVIEW what I considered the wrong application. The answer, in general, will be found in the principles stated above. I wish to see how a question is to be settled as a whole, before entering upon an aimless agitation of any of its parts, or an effort to sow doubt or distrust thereon. If the time should ever come when I would not sincerely and joyfully entertain and seek to maintain, the views of this people, and I should chance then to have a position upon the paper, their proper representatives would be notified at once to seek some one to manage their organ who could do so in harmony with their views. And if any one supposes that I would, under these circumstances, take advantage of my position to publish views contrary to established faith of the body, or calculated to throw doubt or confusion upon any of their cherished points of faith, they greatly mistake my estimate of what would be honest or honorable. Whatever I should have to say in that direction, would be said only by the permission of those authorized to grant it, or through some channel provided for the purpose.

Relative to my present position, I can say that everything seems clear and satisfactory to my own mind. I do not know that I could make it appear so to others, though I should be willing to try under proper circumstances; but my convictions, so far as my own case is concerned, are of course sufficient. I do not anticipate any severer tests in time to come than have already been met and surmounted. Hence I consider myself now more firmly established than ever before in reference to every feature of this work. I do not, of course, presume to say the sincerity of my profession and the strength of my devotion to what I believe to be the cause of God. But my steps are onward with a firm trust for grace sufficient for my day, and for a way of escape on the right side of the slough of despond, out of every supposable period of temptation and trial.

The reader will pardon this lengthy, and to me distasteful, allusion to my own personal matters. I have made it for reasons stated at the beginning.

URIAH SMITH.

0110

O CONSISTENCY !

WE refer to the attitude the various churches have assumed relative to Eld. Canright since he has left us and commenced his war upon us. These churches in popular parlance seem to have "pooled their issues" and given a new illustration of the old political phrase, "Anything to beat Grant." Methodists, Baptists, Disciples, first-day Adventists, doctors of divinity, here and there, feel wondrously happy in welcoming to their folds this Adventist of twenty-eight years' standing; ordain him in a few weeks over a church, inviting him here and there to preach in their pulpits, furnishing him generous space in the columns of their religious papers to "expose Adventism," etc, etc.

A large experience in Adventism does not seem to hurt a man very much if he will only leave it, and come over and preach for them. They class us with all kinds of fanatics in their public attacks upon us; but we have before noticed that they are

wonderfully glad to get any of us into their churches if we will only come over to them. Would they do this so quickly should a person leave the Mormons, Spiritualists, or others with whom they are kind enough to class us? Would they have a reformed spiritual medium over a church, occupying the pulpit in a few weeks after he had left them? or a Mormon elder? How is this?

Again, they do not seem to be wonderfully particular either whether a man believes with them even on cardinal and very important points in their system of theology, if he will only leave the Adventists, and go for them hard enough. For instance, take the case of Eld. Canright himself. All of his old friends knew full well if there was any doctrine of the Advent faith upon which he delighted to write and speak, it was the sleep of the dead and the total destruction of the wicked. If there was anything he felt happy in flaying alive it was the doctrine of endless misery, the folly of the idea of going to heaven at death, and the monstrous doctrines which grow out of the heathen notion of the immortality of the soul. Here he was in his element. We can furnish our orthodox brethren who now love the Elder so much, some hundreds of pages from his pen which will no doubt edify them greatly on these subjects.

We feel warranted in believing that they have taken the Elder in, and made him a pastor, and fully indorse him as a

0111

minister, and he still holding to these terrible "infidel notions," as they sometimes characterize these views. The reason why we so believe is that in all his raid upon us and our doctrines, ridiculing and opposing, we recollect not a word from his pen intimating that we are wrong concerning our views of the soul and the dead. We are also informed that in his examination before the council of Baptist ministers, just before his re-ordination at Otsego last spring, when those points of faith involving the soul question came up, the Elder was meekly modest in his statements, and "wanted time" to further examine the subject before he felt inclined to state his positions. And also that he was accorded a private examination by the council of divines on this question, the proceedings and result of which we have never been able to learn. We therefore conclude that the Elder has put a padlock upon that mouth which so freely speaks on other subjects, and agrees to keep these views to himself. He probably does not consider them "so important" as of yore. In view of this state of things, we feel ourselves fully justified in concluding that here are a few "rags" of Adventism which the Elder has not yet given up.

The family of doctrines growing out of the immortality of the soul is a large one, and one, also, which is considered of vast importance in the orthodox platform of faith. Indeed, we have often know divines of that persuasion, when opposing us, plainly to state that they considered our views of the non-immortality of the soul far more "infidel" and dangerous than our views of the Sabbath. Yet now that the Elder will oppose Adventism, he is taken into full communion at once, granted large range, lauded in their papers, made a fullfledged pastor in a few weeks, and made much of in many ways. What a beautiful consistency do we see here on both sides! They take him in, ignoring one of their most important doctrines, intrusting the sheep of their fold to one holding heretical views, which they have ever considered exceedingly dangerous, while he padlocks his mouth on

a doctrine which for a quarter of a century he has considered a matter of vast importance, leaving the people under his charge, the responsibility of whose souls is intrusted to his keeping, ignorant of a most important Bible truth. "So they wrap it up." But they can join hands in making a raid on the Adventists, even as Pilate and Herod could settle their quarrels and unite their interests when the Saviour of the world was being persecuted. "O consistency, thou art a jewel!"

G.I.B.

0112

IT WILL NOT MIX.

THAT system of belief which we denominate "the present truth," possesses this peculiar feature, that it will not mix with anything else. It is a sharp, clean-cut, decisive doctrine. It admits of no halving, copartnership, or compromise. No system of heretical belief or non-belief can be found which has grown up out of its tenets, having them for a foundation. If a person holding these doctrines wishes to be anything else, he has first to turn square about and renounce these views.

To illustrate: If we believed in the immortality of the soul, and should then be taken in the snare of Spiritualism, we might plead that our second position was the logical result of the first; for the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is the very foundation of Spiritualism; if we were keeping Sunday, and then should turn Roman Catholic, we might plead that, having followed tradition in the Sunday festival as of equal authority with the word of God, we are logically bound to follow it on all other questions, which would compel us to accept the whole quagmire of popish superstitions and festivals. But the "present truth" presents no such sequence. It cannot be charged with having a tendency to carry its adherents forward into any form of error; for any change from this comes by renunciation, not by evolution.

With quite a flourish of trumpets it is being represented at the present time that Adventism is ruining a great many people. But how are they being ruined by it?—Oh! by their giving it up!—just as it is said that pins save a great many people's lives by their not swallowing them. The trouble is, they don't stick to it; if they did, they would not be ruined. The names of thirty-six ministers, we are told, can be produced, who have once preached the Seventh-day Adventist faith, and either been ruined by it, or else gave it up for Spiritualism, Universalism, atheism, infidelity, etc. That is it exactly. "They gave it up." They did not build themselves up on this foundation into infidelity, Spiritualism, atheism, etc., and they were not ruined by it while they adhered to it. It cannot then be consistently charged that Adventism has a tendency to lead men into these errors. But why have so many given it up? On this point we do not wish to pass judgment on any one, or to impugn any one's motives. It will be sufficient to say that the subsequent lives of a majority of these have

0113

testified that it was because the way was too strait, and they were unwilling to live up to the standard which this work presents. But the standard here is certainly no higher than that erected for us in the word of God itself.

And how long a time has it taken to develop this imposing array of thirty-six ministers who have turned away from this faith?-Forty-two years, or since 1845, when the first minister embrace it. And how does our ministry stand at the present time?-Including licentiates, most of whom are in the field as active laborers, they now number 379. Thus where one has given it up, ten have stepped in to take his place. At this rate the ranks bid quite fair to be kept full.

U.S.

THE TWO LAWS AND THE SABBATH

To those who are acquainted with the reasons upon which S.D. Adventists base their views of the Sabbath, nothing would be necessary to be said under this head. But to those who may not be so familiar with these reasons, and who may cherish a candid, inquiring spirit in reference to our views, a few words may be in place. In a brief article we can touch upon only a few general principles, but enough, we trust, to show the nature of the ground we occupy.

The best point of attack upon the Sabbath question, our opponents are coming to think is the position we hold in reference to the distinction between "laws which are called moral," and this is now prominently set forth as the chief point of attack. They well understand that if this distinction can be broken down, everything is thrown into confusion, and in the general chaos they can very plausibly work in the abolition of the Sabbath, which is the point they want to gain. Hence Eld. C. labors to show that in the days of Moses, all the law which the most advanced religious people on the earth had any knowledge of, either human or divine, was "an entire system," a "law taken in all its parts," and that it "was a burdensome system," a "yoke of bondage," a "school-master designed only to lead us to Christ;" that it was "against us and contrary to us," and was therefore "nailed to the cross."

If there was but one law, these conclusions would naturally follow. All was nailed to the cross; and the Sabbath with all the rest went by the board. But if this is so, then there are some of the most wretched contradictions to be found in the Bible, that can be found in any book on earth. And fundamental distinctions that exist in the very nature of things must be strangely ignored.

0114

Let us see. The apostle John says: "Whosoever committeth sin, worketh lawlessness; for sin is lawlessness;" very properly rendered in our version, "Whosoever committeth sin, transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law." This is good New Testament doctrine, written some sixty years after the time when it is claimed by some that all law was done away, and men had only the gospel. To the same import are the declarations of the apostle Paul to the Romans, that by the law is the knowledge of

sin (3:20); that where no law is there is no transgression (4:15); and that sin is not imputed when there is no law (5:13); and he says again, "I had not known sin but by the law" (7:7).

These declarations lay down a fundamental principle on this subject. They show that the field covered by sin, is covered by something else called the law; that this is subject to the same limitations; that there is a set of regulations, a code of morals, the neglect or violation of any part of which by any morally responsible being at any time, in any place, and under any circumstances, is "sin"; and that this by itself, and independent of everything else, is a "law."

This being acknowledged (and every one must admit it), the distinction between laws is acknowledged, for there certainly are other rules and regulations the neglect or violation of which is not held as the evidence and test of sin. For instance, Paul says that "by one man [Adam] sin entered into the world and death by sin." Adam then violated that law the transgression of which John says is sin. What was Adam's sin?-It was in disobeying God in reference to the restrictions of the forbidden tree, an act which involved a violation of the first and last, third, fifth, and sixth principles of the decalogue, at least. Adam could not in his palmiest days violate any one of these without becoming a sinner. But while he stood in his innocency it was no sin in him that he was not baptized, no sin in him that he did not pay tithes, no sin in him that he did not celebrate the Lord's supper, and no sin in him that he did not present offerings and oblations to the Lord. But afterward there were laws and regulations given touching all these points. But these could not belong to that system by which is the knowledge of sin. Even to-day the ordinances of the gospel are not appealed to in the cases of worldly men to show that they are sinners. If we are told that a certain man is a sinner, and we ask why, the answer is not, Because he is not baptized or Because he does not partake of the Lord's supper, or Because he does not contribute to the support of the gospel; but it is always Because he has transgressed some one or more of the principles of the decalogue.

And view of this subject must be only a partial and onesided view which does not go back to the beginning and take

0115

up first principles. When God placed Adam in Eden, we have no reason to suppose that he designed that he should ever sin; and if he never had sinned, he would have been under obligation to those laws only which were necessary to regulate his relation to God and to his fellow-beings. But this is just the field covered by the decalogue, no more, no less. And he would have had the Sabbath; for that was given to him, as the record expressly states, before the fall, and was "sanctified," that is, placed under the sanctions of law. So if sin never had come into the world, all the world would have been keeping the Sabbath to-day. Think of this.

But when man sinned, a remedy was provided. Another law was instituted, and law of ceremonies and sacrifices, through which men might show their penitence and desire for forgiveness. Now the law which shows sin, which existed before sin, which would have existed and governed the world if sin never had entered, cannot be the same as the law which owed its existence to the presence of sin, and was designed as a remedy for sin. This distinction exists in the very nature of things, and the efforts of men to

abolish it, and their stout words in denying it, do not affect the case a particle. A man uses a knife carelessly and inflicts upon himself a severe wound. The surgeon spreads on a plaster to mollify and restore it. Now men may assert as much as they please, that the knife and the plaster are the same; but we know, after they are through as well as we did before, that they are not.

When God separated Israel unto himself, and committed his cause in the earth into their hands, he kept prominently before them the same distinction. His own law, the summary of moral principles, the primary and universal law which antedated the fall, he proclaimed with his own voice, wrote with his own finger on the tables of stone, and set it apart by itself in the ark in the most holy place of the sanctuary. Men may say that these marked and wonderful circumstances so not indicate any distinction between these laws and the laws given them to regulated their sacrifices and offerings. But such assertions amount to nothing; the distinction is there just the same. To those who attach great importance to mere verbal technicalities we may say, that these commandments by themselves are called a law. Ex.24:12: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Come up to me into the mount, and be there, and I will give thee tables of stone, and a law, and commandments which I have written." We know that the only words which God wrote at that time, so far as the record goes, were the "ten words" which he engraved upon the tables.

This law was the first condition of the covenant which God made with Israel, and with reference to this the whole sanctuary service was instituted and carried forward from day to day and from year to year.

0116

It was this law, in vindication of the perpetuity, honor, and majesty of which Christ gave his life. For he died because man had transgressed law, and the way back to salvation was not over broken-down barriers and the demolition of the law which should satisfy its just claims. And we may be sure that he did not abolish by his death that law which his death was to vindicate and honor; and his death was to bear, and did bear, this very testimony to that law by which his death was to vindicate and honor; and his death was to bear, and did bear, this very testimony to that law by which is the knowledge of sin, and the transgression of which is sin. But according to Eld. C., Christ nailed to the cross and abolished all law, and consequently the very law which condemned men as transgressors, and on account of which condemnation his life was given. A more unreasonable position, and a more superficial view of the plan of salvation it would be hard to find.

That which was taken away, which ended at the cross, was simply that shadowy system which pointed to the cross, not the standard of morality which showed men to be sinners. For a time, that is during the period of the Mosaic dispensation, the two systems were together in the hands of one people. They had the Sabbath of the moral law, and they had the ceremonial law. Some of the services of the latter were to be performed on the Sabbath. Hence there was frequent mention of the two together. And now with a gravity which is amusing a long array of texts is presented in which they are mentioned together, as proof that they all belonged to one system. Such reasoning is too flimsy for serious consideration.

It is with reference to the same law, the law which shows what sin is, and the transgression of which is sin, that Christ perform his priestly ministrations. It was with reference to this that the priests of the old dispensation ministered. But their ministry was a shadow of Christ's ministry. Heb.8:5. Christ's ministry is the reality, the substance, shadowed forth by theirs. Hence the law, that object with reference to which the shadow was performed, which we know was the law in the ark, must be the very same as that in the real ministry of this dispensation. Or, to put it in other language, the real ministry of Christ must be performed with reference to the same law in every particular, with reference to which the shadowy ministration of the Levitical priesthood was performed. If not, then their ministry was not a shadow of his, the two dispensations are rent asunder, and the whole arrangement of God's grace in both the Old and New Testaments is thrown into chaos. Men ought to pause before taking a position involving such conclusions.

The whole difficulty arises from confounding the two laws. But when the distinction is admitted, and the perpetuity of the moral law is conceded, the Sabbath comes down with all the

0117

rest unchanged. It is the same blessed, beneficent institution that it has ever been, and some are yet to be found with enough of the love of God in their hearts to accept and observe it, rather than to throw away the whole law of God in order to get rid of it.

We have not space to go into an examination of this subject in the interesting field of the New Testament. Its writers plainly show that one law is taken out of the way (Eph.2:15; Col.2:14), the other remains (Matt.5:17); one is made void by faith in Christ (Gal.5:2), the other is not (Rom.3:31); one will judge men in the last day (James 2:11,12), the other is nailed to the cross, and no man is to be judged by it (Col.2:16). So we might contrast them in many particulars from their own testimony. The reader is referred to a list of the contradictions involved in the New Testament, if there is but one law, and that is all done away, as found in the work entitled "The Two Laws," published at the REVIEW Office.

U.S.

IS IT REASONABLE?

ELD. CANRIGHT has brought up as a grievance which provoked him to enter upon his present war upon the Adventists, the fact that Eld. Gage, at the close of a series of some half a dozen discourses against this people last summer, circulated a tract among his audience at the close of his meetings. The whole truth concerning the matter is simply this: The Elder had been speaking concerning Mrs. White. All Eld. Gage did was to give the audience still more upon the same subject, every word of which was from Eld. Canright's own pen. So practically Eld. Gage only gave the audience opportunity to receive still another discourse from him on the subject under consideration. We submit to the reader if it is becoming in Eld. C. to complain under such circumstances.

G.I.B.

WHO CHANGED THE SABBATH?

IT is often remarked that new converts are the most zealous. It is also true in general that apostates are the most bitter opponents. To this, however, there are notable exceptions; yet exceptions are never supposed to invalidate a rule. I have spent many years trying to induce people to embrace the present truth, and so hard have I labored to this end that I rejoice in every accession to the church. Of course, I cannot but feel sad over every defection. So deeply do I realize the weakness of human nature that I can well appreciate the exhortation in Gal.6:1. Even if we cannot restore the erring, we may be led to greater watchfulness by our efforts, not knowing where next the darts of the enemy may be aimed. It is not a strange idea that the faith of every one will be tested; that a shaking time is before us in which, to use the words of Scripture on another subject, only that which cannot be shaken will remain.

There lies before me an article by Eld. D.M. Canright, in which he assails the views held by Seventh-day Adventists on the question, "Who changed the Sabbath?" I am not at all surprised that he tries to make strong assertions to uphold weak points. Self-confidence in asserting his positions was his prominent failing, and one which has, no doubt, had much to do in placing him where he now stands. He had an unfortunate peculiarity of setting himself up as a standard of both thought and action for all who came within the range of his influence. But, most unfortunately for him, he made himself the standard for himself as well as for others, and he has not yet nearly reached the position to which such a following will lead him.

He particularly assails us on the above question because, he says, this lies at the foundation of the main point of our faith, that Sunday-keeping will yet become the mark of the beast. Of this he says:-

My experience is that a belief of this as a fact induces more persons to give up Sunday for Saturday than all other arguments made by the Seventh-day people. Convince a man that Sunday-keeping is only a Catholic institution, a rival to the Lord's Sabbath, and hateful to God, and of course, if he has any conscience, he will keep it no longer. Every one of them accepts this as an historical fact in fulfillment of Dan.7:25. Indeed, this is the one main pillar of their whole system,

upon which all the rest depends. If their position on this is false, then their whole system of prophetic interpretation is also false, as they will readily admit.

No, we will not readily admit any such thing. Nor would they who now so gladly publish his articles, because they seem to do injury to Seventh-day Adventism, so cheerfully give them circulation, if they stopped to consider the consequences to which such unguarded declarations lead. It is a fact that the Bible Banner, and the World's Crisis, and other papers which publish his articles, fully agree with us on our "whole system of prophetic interpretation;" but they deny the correctness of our application of a

single symbol. And if we could become convinced that our interpretation of Rev.13:11-17, is wrong, we should still insist that our whole system of prophetic interpretation is right. Ours is the literal, as opposed to the mystical system of prophetic interpretation. While these papers rest their whole advent faith upon this same system, they stand committed to the position that, if our application of this symbol of Rev.13:11-17, and of the mark of the beast which stands connected with it, is wrong, then the whole system of the literal interpretation of the prophecies is false! We do, indeed, claim that our application of this symbol is the logical result of following this system; but we will not be so ungenerous as to hold the papers to which we have referred, to the consequences of that which they have virtually indorsed, namely, if our interpretation of the two-horned beast and the mark of the beast is wrong, then the whole literal system of prophetic interpretation is also wrong. Our system of faith is largely based on our interpretation of this prophecy; but we have never gone so far as to assert that if our faith on this point is wrong, then the whole literal system of prophetic interpretation is false. It has been reserved to Eld. Canright to take that position for us. But as he has copyrighted it, we may not be able to realize the full benefit of it!

Having shown the importance of the question to our faith, he proceeds to combat our claim that the papacy changed the Sabbath to Sunday. On this he says:-

It would seem that such a bold and radical position should be supported by the clearest and most abundant evidence. They claim it is an actual historical fact that at a certain time, about 500 after Christ, the pope did change the Sabbath to Sunday. If this be so, of course they should be able to procure reliable

0120

historical proof for it, giving the time, place, manner, facts, and reasons for so remarkable an occurrence. I have before me two books written expressly to prove this assertion. They are "Who Changed the Sabbath?" 24 pages, and "Marvel of Nations," 282 pages. But the only proof offered is simply quotations from Catholic catechisms, which claim that their Church made the change. And this is all the historical proof they can present on this point! Yes, for all that the Sabbatarian writers and scholars for the last 200 years have been able to find is just this and nothing more. Not one single historian in all the annals of the world has ever stated that the pope changed the Sabbath. For twenty-eight years I longed for such a testimony, but found it not.

I have thus largely quoted, as this paragraph gives the complete substance of his whole article, that the reader may see exactly what is his claim. The paragraph affords much food for reflection, and opens before our view a large amount of false reasoning.

1. We learn that for twenty-eight years he longed for what he considered evidence essential to establish the very foundation of the faith that he preached, "but found it not"! While this may or may not be hard on our faith, it is very discreditable to his experience in the ministry, considering that he was strong and confident in his assertions that the faith he preached was fully and completely proved. His longing for twenty-eight years for proof which he could consider satisfactory shows that he was not as confident as he assumed to be. Is he now?

2. He does not seem to realize that the question that should govern us on all points of duty is, What say the Scriptures? I have always claimed, and still claim, that

proof of the real origin of the Sunday Sabbath is a secondary matter, while it is admitted by very many of its most ardent and learned advocates that its origin cannot be traced to any requirement in the Scriptures. And whether they confess it or not, the fact remains, that it is not of Bible origin, plain to the sight of every one who reads his Bible with any care. A man, "if he has any conscience," will not wait to settle the question of its origin, if he has set before him the evidence that God's law requires the observance of the seventh day, and that the Bible is entirely silent in regard to any other day to be observed as a weekly Sabbath.

3. He entirely evades the issue, instead of settling it,

0121

when he offers proof that the Christians met for worship on the first day of the week in the days immediately following the apostles. Query: Did they observe it as a Sabbath, or day of rest from secular labor? Eld. Canright knows very well that they did not. He knows also, if he has ever examined history on the subject, that in those very days Christians assembled for worship on the sixth day also, in commemoration of the death of the Lord, and that neither the first nor the sixth was held as a Sabbath till after the celebrated decree of Constantine for resting on the venerable day of the sun. After that time it was adopted by the Church of Rome, and made the "chief festival of the Church," because it was easier to reach the people if they kept the same day that was popularized by the emperor, and to which they were allied in their adoration of the sun.

4. He surely cannot be so ignorant of history as to believe, though he affirms it, that the observance of the first day of the week as a day of worship was universal among Christians in "the days immediately following the apostles." I am aware that room for a world of quibbling is opened under the expression, "a day of worship;" because in that manner may be brought in the custom of holding religious worship and thence repairing to their usual avocations on that day. But that would be but a cavil, for he is now considering the erection of the first day as a Sabbath, and the fact that they met for worship on that day is not proof, inasmuch as the proof is clear that they did not rest from labor upon it. After the time of Constantine's decree, and after the Church of Rome had adopted it as the day of special observance, and put the seventh day under its ban, there were many in the Eastern churches who still observed the seventh day, who resisted the usurpation of the Romish Church; and the anathemas of the council held at Laodicea were among the means of bringing them to submit to the change.

5. Before presenting direct evidence on the question, I will say something on Eld. C.'s flourish over our not being able to give time, place, manner, facts, and reasons of the papacy's erecting the Sunday-Sabbath institution. I propose to show that all this can be done, definitely and to a certainty. But I insist that it is not necessary to our position; our faith may be fully and sufficiently established without doing half that he asks.

0122

He will find himself by no means so well prepared to defend the Sunday-Sabbath as we are to assail it. Let us institute a few comparisons:-

Suppose that I owe Eld. Canright a sum of money; in payment I offer him a bill which he claims is counterfeit. In proof he shows: (a.) that the detector gives a very accurate description of the genuine, but this does not resemble it in a single feature. This he thinks ought to settle the matter. (b.) There is a notorious counterfeiter at hand, who has literally flooded the land with counterfeits; and he has executed them so well that the majority prefer them to the genuine. Of course this emboldens him in his work, and he does not deny his occupation; he rather boasts of his skill in counterfeiting. He comes forward and says that he made that bill; he declares that it is one of the best that he ever made. He has even held it up as evidence of his great ability as a counterfeiter. (c.) Ever since it has been in circulation, there have been officers of the Government who pronounced it a counterfeit. It is further proved that its circulation was resisted by the people, but the counterfeiter got together a company of his confederates, and they resolved to boycott, to waylay, to maltreat all those who would not receive it. And it is shown that these were the means by which it came to be regarded as of any value. (d.) It is further shown that in all places where he had the controlling influence, they abused and even put to death those who should be found in possession of the genuine. All this Eld. C. offers, to justify his refusal to accept my bill.

But to this I make reply, that, (a.) we cannot take the word of the counterfeiter; his testimony is ruled out. (b.) It is admitted that everything alleged against the counterfeiter is true, except as regards this particular bill. (c.) It has for so long a time been received as valuable, that custom establishes the fact of its value. Evidences to the contrary are of no weight. (d.) But, as most decisive of all. I call upon Eld. C. to show the time, place, and manner in which this particular bill was made; he must show the identical tools which were used, and he must plainly declare the facts and reasons which induced the counterfeiter to make this bill. I do not claim that all this can be done in regard to the other counterfeits; it is enough that they stand condemned by the detector. But this is an exceptional case. In regard to

0123

this bill I say that he must either show all this, or accept the bill, or lose his debt.

After all this array of "proofs," it is just possible that Eld. Canright might prove so exacting as to still refuse to receive the bill. But every one will acknowledge that he would only be notional in so doing. It is so out of harmony with his claim in parallel cases!

6. To show that I am correct in saying that his claim in regard to this particular institution is exceptional and unreasonable, I now call upon him to show the origin of infant baptism. Let him declare to us the time, place, and manner in which it was instituted. I shall not accept, as proof in the case, instances of its being practiced; these are evidences of its existence, but not of its institution or origin. Let him show the particular facts and reasons which first led to its practice, and when I prove that it was practiced in the days immediately following the apostles, as I hereby offer to do, let him accept it as a valid, Christian ordinance, or renounce the untenable ground upon which he stands. Nor can he evade this by saying that it may be proved that they held meeting for worship on Sunday earlier than the time of the first mention of infant baptism, for meeting for worship on that day gives it no pre-eminence over the sixth day, on which

also they held meeting; and I offer to prove that infant baptism was practiced nearly two centuries before there was any observance. If he doubts my ability to do this, it can easily be tested. I am willing to be held to all my offers whenever he comes forward to give the counter evidence.

7. Infant baptism does not stand alone antedating Sunday-keeping. With it we find sprinkling, first in connection with immersion and then as a substitute for immersion, infant communion, consecration water in baptism, belief in baptismal regeneration, and many other superstitions. Every one of these can plead the authority of the Fathers, antiquity, the days following the apostles, etc. And every one of them was considered pious and Christian before there was any idea of piety connected with any manner of keeping Sunday. And every one of them claimed, not the teachings of the apostles, but "apostolic traditions."

8. Not to be tedious, I will notice just one point more:

0124

Eld. C. lays great stress on finding that meetings were held on Sunday in the days immediately following the apostles, and long before the rise of the papal Church. But he cannot find any Sunday institution in those days. And if he could, what then? Paul said the mystery of iniquity was already working in his day, and every true Protestant believes that the mystery of iniquity gave rise to that man of sin - the papacy. Can Eld. Canright point to a single act in the working of that mystery of iniquity in Paul's day, or in the days immediately following the apostles? It was working then, and continued to work until the man of sin stood in full view. But will he undertake to specify a single act in its working in those days? I confidently take this position, and respectfully ask any and all to show that it is not reasonable and just; namely, that practice or institution in the church, not ordained by divine authority, not plainly proved in the Scriptures, which can be traced to the time nearest to the days of the apostles, has the strongest claim to stand first in the working of that mystery of iniquity! Paul also said that after his departing, grievous wolves should enter in among them, and of their own selves should men arise, speaking perverse things, etc. Admitted that a practice is proved to have existed immediately after the days of Peter and Paul, if it is not authorized by the Scriptures, it is identified as being among the perverse things brought in by grievous wolves, and is to be classed as the working of the mystery of iniquity, by which that man of sin was brought to view. It was his special delight to change the times and laws of the Most High, and to multiply man-made institutions, and to compel their observance as a part of Christianity.

I might carry much further the comparison between Sunday-keeping and other innovations and superstitions which had their origin in the effort to amalgamate Christianity and paganism. Many of the Fathers had been pagans, not a few of them pagan philosophers, and these were not slow to assume the position of teachers, and to leave their fancies and vagaries on record as the faith of the church. But with all the exhortations to cling to the law and the testimony alone, to the Scriptures of truth, they who follow these false lights away from the words of life, are without excuse. I am well aware that there is a strong effort made in the churches to separate Sunday

0125

from the other relics of pagan superstitions and human institutions, but in opening the way to gratify Eld. Canright's long-standing desire to see proof that the papacy displaced the Sabbath of the Lord, and set up Sunday in its stead, I here state two propositions:-

1. Among all the traditions and human innovations in the Christian church, there is none that can so clearly and positively be traced to paganism as the Sunday.

2. Among all the institutions which have been foisted upon the church by the papal power, there is no one that is so clearly marked, so definitely outlined in its origin and enforcement, as the festival of the Sunday.

I wish here to have it understood that I shall not take the time or the space to examine all the other traditions and superstitions that obtained a foot-hold in the church, and passed for Christian doctrines and ordinances, so as to draw the comparison and show which is the most distinctively pagan and papal. I only take it upon me to fully and clearly show that the Sunday has its origin as a day of regard and observance in paganism and the papacy. If any wish to have the comparison more fully traced, and think that they can show that other traditions have a better right to the claim of such origin, I shall be willing to carry the investigation further, for, though I hope to satisfy every reasonable requirement and every candid mind, I do not propose to exhaust the proofs which are in reach.

1. Is it a fact that the observance of Sunday as a day of rest from secular employment is distinctively and only of pagan origin?

To all true Protestants, who take "the Bible and the Bible alone," who do not believe that their Christian character can be correctly formed by any standard but that which God has revealed, who do not believe there is any obedience where there is no precept or requirement, - to all such the plea of custom and tradition can have no weight. In regard to any custom, our inquiry is not, Did it exist? but, By what authority did it exist? We have little regard for what men have done; that does not reach our consciences; for that we go to history, and then we are often misinformed. We ask what they ought to have done, and to settle this we go the Bible, and are never deceived. And none can be deceived in going there, unless its testimony is covered up with inferences

0126

and traditions. I wish the reader to bear in mind what justly belongs to the examination of duty in regard to laws and institutions. The only question admissible is, What does the commandment of God say? Has it been as plainly amended or repealed as it was enacted? If not, no amount of tradition, custom, precedent, or reasoning can set it aside. But we are constantly going beyond what can be reasonably asked of us, and their conclusions unjust.

In answering the question I have asked on the first proposition, I shall show that the authority, the name, and the sacredness of Sunday are entirely of pagan origin.

Every one who has read the debate between Campbell and Purcell must have been struck with Mr. Campbell's perfect familiarity with church history. The bishop appeared to be unusually fair for an advocate of "the church," but on one point he was either inclined to take knowledge of church history and the writings of the Fathers. Mr.

Campbell was an advocate of Sunday-keeping; in his theology, Sunday was the Lord's day. But his learning often led him to make statements with which his theology was not in harmony. He was president of Bethany College, in Virginia, a denominational institution. Before a graduating class in the year 1884, he used the following language:-

Was the first day set apart by public authority in the apostolic age? - No. By whom was it set apart, and when? - By Constantine, who lived about the beginning of the fourth century.

These words I copied from one of their journals published in Cincinnati, the lecture having been revised by Mr. Campbell himself before its publication. According to this, Constantine was the one - the first one - who set apart by authority the first day of the week. Constantine's Sunday decree was issued in 321. Dr. Heylyn, in his "History of the Sabbath," an extensive and reliable work, speaking of their holding meetings on Sunday, said:-

For three hundred years there was neither law to bind them to it nor any rest from labor or from worldly business required upon it.

0127

In a subsequent section of the same part (2) of his work, he said:-

Tertullian tells us that they did devote the Sunday partly unto mirth and recreation, not to devotion altogether; when in a hundred years after Tertullian's time, there was no law nor constitution to restrain men from labor in this day, in the Christian churches.

These testimonies are exactly in harmony with that of Mr. Campbell. He says that Constantine was the first to set apart the first day of the week. This was in 321. Heylyn says there was no law for three hundred years. This would throw it forward to the time of Constantine. He also says it was a hundred years after Tertullian's time. This is not definite, nor is the time of Tertullian's death known. Authorities point to about 321, or not long after; and this again points to the time of Constantine.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor, who, with Heylyn, was a Church of England writer, said:-

The primitive Christians did all manner of work upon the Lord's day, even in the times of persecutions, when they were the strictest observers of all the divine commandments; but in this they knew there was none; and therefore, when Constantine the emperor had made an edict against working on the Lord's day, yet he excepts and still permitted all agriculture or labors of the husbandmen whatsoever.

The Encyclopedia Britannica says:-

It was Constantine the Great who first made a law for the proper observance of Sunday; and who; according to Eusebius, appointed it should be regularly celebrated throughout the Roman Empire.

These are a very few of the very many testimonies at hand which definitely state that the law of Constantine was the first law which set apart the first day of the week, or required rest from secular work on Sunday. More are not necessary to quote, from the fact that not a single authority can be produced that gives any other date or authority for the first Sunday law. If Eld. Canright takes exception to this statement, will he please to name a single historian who has ever given any other date, or any other authority? Until

he does at least this much - until he shows that there is some difference of opinion, some disagreement among learned and reliable authors

0128

on the subject, I shall claim that this part of my proposition is fully and sufficiently proved. The value of these testimonies is better appreciated by considering the fact that the witnesses were all friends and advocates of Sunday-keeping.

Next we will look for the origin of the name of the institution that Constantine set apart. It is found in the law itself, which is as follows:-

Let all the judges and towns-people, and the occupation all trades, rest upon the venerable day of the sun; but let those who are situated in the country, freely and at full liberty, attend to the business of agriculture; because it often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn and planting vines: lest the critical moment being let slip, men should lose the commodities granted by Heaven.

Thus in the first law for the observance of the day, it was designated the day of the sun. Not a very high or honorable title. How came this title to be given to it? The Religious Encyclopedia says:-

The ancient Saxons called it by this name, because upon it they worshiped the sun.

According to this, the title originated in heathen idolatry. Do authorities agree upon this? - Yes; there is not an author in all the rounds of history or literature who dissents from this. Webster says:-

The heathen nations in the north of Europe dedicated this day to the sun, and hence their Christian descendants continue to call the day Sunday.

Sunday was a name given by the heathen to the first day of the week, because it was the day on which they worshiped the sun.

This is from the Sunday-school Union Bible Dictionary. Worcester, in his Dictionary, says:-

Sunday; so named because anciently dedicated to the sun or its worship.

These authors give an ancient origin to the name. Constantine was not the originator of the title which he gave to the day. Another historian, Morer, says:-

It is not to be denied, but we borrow the name of this day from the ancient Greeks and Romans, and we allow that the old Egyptians worshiped the sun, and as a standing memorial of their veneration, dedicated this day to him.

0129

Thus it is shown that the title that Constantine gave to the day in the first Sunday law, is an ancient one, and is entirely of heathen origin. From this statement, also, there is no dissent. Eld. Canright cannot even get up any argument on these points. They are most telling against all the inferences by which he has endeavored to uphold himself in his present position, but he is compelled to stand silent before them.

Now having found that the first law for Sunday rest gave it a heathen title, that the name is altogether of heathen origin, I proceed to inquire on what basis the law stood, that is, what was the nature of the edict - what the motive which actuated Constantine in

giving this decree? This also can be settled to a certainty. Many interested religionists, with far more zeal than piety or regard for the precepts of Jehovah, speak of Constantine's edict as a law for the Christian observance of the Lord's day. The very title that he gave it, the origin of that title, and the known use of the title in those times, disprove their assertions. Indeed, their knowledge of the origin of the title ought to cause them to blush when they make such assertions. But our proof is explicit on the point of the motive that gave rise to the first Sunday law. We are not straitened for testimonies in regard to this; they are so numerous that I cannot give a tithe of them. And their importance on the subject under consideration cannot be overestimated.

1. The fact that Constantine gave it the title by which it was known in pagan worship shows that it was not enforced as a Christian institution.

2. It was dated March 7, 321, and March 8, he issued a decree for the examination of the entrails of beasts, for the determining of portents, or for ascertaining the causes of public calamities. This was a heathen custom, and showed the heathenism and superstition that swayed his mind at that time.

3. At the time when these decrees were issued, he had made no profession of Christianity. Indeed, authorities have been quite willing to place the time of his professed conversion after the time when he presided over the Council of Nice, that it might be after the commission of many of his most perfidious and criminal acts.

4. Historians freely testify that at and after the time of issuing his Sunday decree, he was a worshiper of Apollo, the sun-god, and to the close of his life, about

0130

337, retained the title of Pontifex Maximus, or high priest of the heathen hierarchy.

Milman, in the "History of Christianity," b. 3, chap. 1, says:-

It is the day of the sun which is to be observed by the general veneration, the courts were to be closed, and the noise and tumult of public business and legal litigation were no longer to violate the repose of the sacred day. But the believer in the new paganism, of which the solar worship was the characteristic, might acquiesce without scruple, in the sanctity of the first day of the week.

This is well expressed. It was, indeed, a new phase of paganism, for, though the venerable day of the sun had long - very long - been venerated by them and their heathen ancestors, the idea of rest from worldly labor in its worship was entirely new. Gibbon also gives clear testimony on the character of Constantine as a sun-worshiper. In chapter 20 of "History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," he says:-

The devotion of Constantine was more peculiarly directed to the genius of the sun, the Apollo of Greek and Roman mythology; and he was pleased to be represented with the symbols of the god of light and poetry.... The altars of Apollo were crowned with the votive offerings of Constantine; and the credulous multitude were taught to believe that the emperor was permitted to behold with mortal eyes the visible majesty of their tutelary deity.... The sun was universally celebrated as the invincible guide and protector of Constantine.

In a note on the same page is found the following:-

The panegyric of Eumenius which was pronounced a few months before the Italian war, abounds with the most unexceptionable evidence of the pagan superstition of Constantine, and of his particular veneration of Apollo, or the sun.

Keightley, "History of Rome," speaking of Constantine at and after his profession of Christianity, says:-

Constantine, however, was still a polytheist, and his principal object of worship was the sun-god, Apollo. At the same time, with the compliant spirit of polytheism, he held the God of the Christians and the Author of their faith in respect and reverence."

And Dr. Schaff testifies to exactly the same thing; in his "Church History," vol. 2, pp. 14, 15, he says:-

At first Constantine, like his father, in the spirit of Neoplatonic

0131

syncretism of dying heathendom, revered all the gods as mysterious powers; especially Apollo, the god of the sun, to whom, in the year 308, he presented munificent gifts. Nay, so late as the year 321, he enjoined the regular consultation of the soothsayers in public misfortunes, according to ancient heathen usage; even later, he placed his new residence, Byzantium, under the protection of the god of the martyrs, and the heathen goddess of fortune; and down to the end of his life he retained the title and dignity of Pontifex Maximus, or high priest of the heathen hierarchy. His coins bore on the one side the letters of the name of Christ, on the other side the figure of the sun-god, and the inscription, Sol Invictus.

On this same point in regard to Constantine's Christianity after he professed it, the Religious Encyclopedia says:-

The notion of conversion in the sense of a real acceptance of the new religion and a thorough rejection of the old, is inconsistent with the hesitating attitude in which he stood toward both. Much of this may indeed be due to motives of political expediency, but there is a good deal that cannot be so explained. Paganism must still have been an operative belief with the man who, almost down to the close of his life, retained so many pagan superstitions. He was at best only half heathen, half Christian, who could seek to combine the worship of Christ with the worship of Apollo, having the name of the one and the figure of the other impressed upon his coins, and ordaining the observance of Sunday under the name of dies solis in his celebrated decree of March, 321, though such a combination was far from uncommon in the first Christian centuries. Perhaps the most significant illustration of the ambiguity of his religious position is furnished by the fact that in the same year in which he issued his Sunday decree, he gave orders that if lightning struck the imperial palace, or any public building, the haruspices, according to ancient usage, should be consulted as to what it might signify, and a careful report of the answer should be drawn up for his use.

Mosheim, in "Historical Commentaries," p. 469, on the same point says:-

How long Constantine retained these vague and undecided views of religion and religious worship, regarding the Christian religion as excellent, and salutary to the Roman state, yet not esteeming other religions, or those of inferior gods, as vain, pernicious, and odious to God, ... it is difficult to determinate. Zosimus, as is well known, reports that Constantine did not openly profess Christianity, and show himself hostile to the

Romish sacred rites, until after the slaughter of his son Crispus and his wife Fausta; which truly detestable crimes were perpetrated in the year 326.

It cannot be disguised that, at the time of his issuing his Sunday decree, he was a pagan of no very high grade; and his profession of Christianity never raised him much above the average pagan. The Encyclopedia Britannica gives a just estimate of his character. Speaking of the title of "The Great" being conferred upon him, it says:-

Tested by character, indeed, he stands among the lowest of all those to whom the epithet has in ancient or modern times been applied.

Dr. Schaff is justly esteemed as a man of extensive learning, and whose testimony regarding facts, no one would call in question. He is a theologian, and a warm friend of Sunday-keeping. But his theological relations have not prevented his giving the facts in regard to the first Sunday law. He says:-

He enjoined the observance, or, rather, forbade the public desecration of, Sunday, not under the name of Sabbatum or dies Domini, but under its own astrological or heathen title, dies solis, familiar to all his subjects, so that the law was as applicable to the worshipers of Hercules, Apollo, or Mithras, as to the Christians.

And more so, for it referred to heathen, and not at all to Christian worship. Again Dr. Schaff says:-

He enjoined the civil observance of Sunday, though not as dies Domini, but as dies solis, in conformity to his worship of Apollo, and in company with an ordinance for the regular consultation of the Haruspex, 321.

Concerning its claim to be considered a sacred day, it is not necessary to add much to what has already been said by the writers quoted. It would be presumption in the extreme to claim that God ever conferred any blessing or sanctification directly upon it. By a system of false reasoning, they try to make out that the blessing that was conferred upon the seventh day, was transferred to the first. But of course no scripture is ever quoted to justify the claim. The authorities here given say that it was dedicated to the sun; and that dedication

is its only claim to sanctity. In perfect harmony with these, is the following from the Douay Catechism:-

It is also called Sunday from the old Roman denomination, dies solis, the day of the sun, to which it was sacred.

Now, as far as the first proposition is concerned, I think I have done all that I proposed: I have given such proofs, and such an abundance of them, that every candid person must admit that it is clearly proved that the name, origin, authority, and sacredness of the Sunday institution are altogether and only pagan. Thus far there is not a Christian feature about it. With great confidence I approach the examination of the second question, for which the way is so well prepared. But in passing, I will say that I have carefully avoided giving the testimony of any one who was committed in favor of Sabbath-keeping. Every author quoted was in favor of the Sunday. If ever anybody had

a right to feel confident in their position, we surely have in regard to the assertion that the Sunday is, in every feature, a heathen institution. Our opposers themselves have strongly entrenched us in this position, however much the facts have grated on their feelings; and so strongly have they fortified us in this position, that Eld. Canright, with all his assurance, will not attempt a denial - much less make any attempt to disprove it.

2. Is the institution of Sunday, as a church festival, or day of Christian observance, or papal origin? In other words, did the papacy set up the Sunday in the Church as a substitute for the Sabbath of the Lord?

It is easy to see where Eld. Canright fails to apprehend the truth on this point. I say fails to apprehend the truth, for I will not insist that he understands the truth on the subject. We know that his opportunities have been such that he might, yes, ought to have understood the subject; but many who have known him long and well, have always thought that he was more fluent than deep. His failure no doubt lies right here: he does not appreciate the fact that almost everything that is attributed to the Catholic Church, and can be traced to no other source, is more or less veiled in obscurity as to its origin.

In addition to my request for Eld. Canright to inform us when and where infant baptism originated, I invite

0134

him to take up in order the institutions which are attributed to the papacy, even by the church to which he now belongs, and show the precise or exact origin of each. Can he do it? Will he publicly make the attempt? For instance: Does he believe that the popes of Rome ever exercised civil power? He must answer in the affirmative. Will he then inform us when and where that power was conferred? or how they took that power? And if he cannot clearly and satisfactorily do that, will he therefore deny that they ever exercised that power? Or, will he - and be more consistent with himself - assert that it must be of divine origin? A Catholic work now before me, "with the approbation of the Lord Bishop of Beverly" (Sadler, New York), speaking of this, says:-

And now we approach a most important topic - the rise of the temporal power of the popes. There is this which plainly marks it as the gradual, silent work of God. No one can point with precision and certainty to the precise time when it did rise.... It grew as the trees grow from the soil. You cannot say when the acorn first bursts its shell and the lordly oak springs forth. Tell me whence the broad river draws its waters; tell me of all the streams, all the little rivulets and fountains that feed it, and I will then tell you every source which gave rise to the temporal sovereignty of the popes. Like everything natural, everything providential, we can only catch indications of it here and there, in the days of its infancy; for I speak of times long before Charlemagne.

Very few of the dogmas called papal can be traced to their origin. As seen above, the Catholics base their claim on this fact, that you cannot mark their origin; that being believed or practiced so early, they must have been derived from the apostles. This is exactly Eld. Canright's argument against them from this very fact; inasmuch as the Scriptures thoroughly furnish the divine institution, we could easily trace them to their divine origin - to the word of God. It matters not a whit how many or who kept Sunday, or how near to the time of the apostles it was kept. Did God command it? do the

Scriptures thoroughly furnish us with proofs for its observance? Lacking this, it lacks everything that is required to make it a Christian ordinance.

0135

I do not make these remarks because they apply to the Sunday; I do not admit that it stands with the other Papal institutions, veiled in even comparative obscurity. In this respect it has a prominence all its own - it can be traced to the papal power without the least shadow cast upon the evidence. I am confident that I can point out the two springs which, more than all others, gave rise to the baleful stream of temporal church power. But I have called attention to the obscurity of the origin of papal dogmas, solely to show that the advocates of Sunday are inconsistent and unreasonable in their claim; they ask for the Sunday what they cannot begin to give for other institutions which they freely admit are of papal origin. Fortunately, we can meet their most unreasonable demand with full and sufficient proof, as I shall now show.

The reader will bear witness that the origin of the Sunday as a day of rest from labor, has been clearly shown: it is only pagan. We have now to consider its authority as a church institution. I shall show that the papacy took it up from the hands of the emperors, strictly enforced its observance, and took most effective steps to suppress and utterly abolish the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath. Eld. Canright says that on this point we depend entirely on the Catechisms of the Catholic Church; that after 200 years of searching, Sabbath-keepers have not been able to find an item of reliable history to prove our proposition and to justify our faith; that, after twenty-eight years of extensive research and earnest longing, he could not find a particle of proof that the Sunday-Sabbath is a child of the papacy. How extensive his research has been, and how conscientious and sincere he has been in his work of the ministry, and how ingenuous he is in his recent declarations, the reader must judge when the facts are laid before him.

Eusebius, Bishop of Cesarea, was the first to speak of the transfer of the honors and duties of the Sabbath to Sunday. Let the reader carefully note this important fact. His words are as follows:-

And all things whatsoever that it was duty to do on the Sabbath, these we have transferred to the Lord's day, as more appropriately belonging to it, because it has the precedence and is first in rank, and more honorable than the Jewish Sabbath.

0136

I cannot give the room for all the notice that this first Sunday-Sabbath testimony deserves. The Lord, in his own institution, doubtless knew best to which day was most honorable. See Isa.58:13. In this transaction the pronoun "we" cuts a great figure - much greater than it will be able to maintain in the day when God shall bring every work into judgement on the authority of his commandments. Eccl.12:13,14; Rom.2:12,16. Eusebius did not intend to disparage the transfer of Constantine, and fully coincided with his decree in favor of the venerable day of the sun; and he never failed to speak in a manner to tickle the vanity of his royal patron. He spoke the exact truth in regard to the transfer. That the church took it up and united with the emperors in enforcing its

observance, Dr. Heylyn, a historian of undisputed veracity and of unbounded research, testifies thus:-

And as the day of rest from labors, and restraint from business upon that day, it received its greatest strength from the supreme magistrate as long as he retained that power which to him belongs; as after from the canons and decrees of councils, the decretals of popes and orders of particular prelates, when the sole managing of ecclesiastical affairs was committed to them.

Bearing in mind that it has been fully proved that the decree of Constantine was the first authority for Sunday rest, I ask if here is not a most important item of reliable history in proof of our position? Of the times more than a century later than Constantine, Heylyn speaks thus of the building up of this institution:-

The faithful, being united better than before, became more uniform in matters of devotion; and in that uniformity did agree together to give the Lord's day all the honors of an holy festival. Yet was not this done all at once, but by degrees; the fifth and sixth centuries being well-nigh spent before it came into that high which hath since continued. The emperors and the prelates in these times had the same affections; being earnest to advance this day above all other; and to the edicts of the one, and ecclesiastical constitutions of the other, it stands indebted for many of those privileges and exemptions which it still enjoyeth.

0137

One of the most effectual means of degrading the Sabbath, and of exalting the Sunday above it, in the feelings and practice of the people, was to make the Sabbath a fast-day, and to forbid fasting on the Sunday. A rigidly enforced fast is always burdensome to any people; and while the Sabbath was made a gloomy day to them, everything was done that could be, to make the Sunday a day of personal enjoyment. It is easy to tell which day would become the popular one, under such circumstances. This was the course pursued by the governors of the church, as all historians testify. It was a shrewd step in the direction of an entire change of the day of Sabbath observance. But it was not by any one step that this change was brought about. Nor was it a brief work. As the historian says: It was not done all at once, but by degrees. Dr. Hase, in his "Church History," thus testifies:-

The Roman Church regarded Saturday as a fast-day in direct opposition to those who regarded it as a Sabbath. Sunday remained a joyful festival in which all fasting and worldly business were avoided as much as possible, but the original commandment of the decalogue respecting the Sabbath was not then applied to that day.

This practice, "in direct opposition to those who regarded it as a Sabbath," was altogether of Rome. The Eastern churches long refused to comply with this order, as Dr. Heylyn testifies:-

In this difference it stood a long time together, till in the end the Roman Church obtained the cause, and Saturday became a fast almost through all parts of the Western world. I say the Western world, and of that alone, the Eastern churches being so far from altering their ancient custom that in the sixth council of Constantinople, A. D. 692, they did admonish those of Rome to forbear fasting on that day upon pain of censure.

But Rome prevailed. It was decreed by the Council of Nice, and confirmed by Constantine, that "the primacy should remain with Rome;" and, though the Eastern churches long resisted the usurpations of the Roman bishops, this decree was never reversed, and the emperors were diligent to see that it was enforced. As long as the primacy of Rome was acknowledged, and maintained by the emperors, of course the faith promulgated by Rome was "catholic," and all dissenters were

0138

heretics, to be punished with anathemas from the Church, and more immediate penalties by the emperors. The action of Justinian, who fully established the supremacy of the pope (John II.), is proof as strong as any can require, that the emperors stood at nothing that could make effective the Roman faith. The following is from Bower's "History of the Popes:"-

While the Arian king was striving by the most just and equitable laws, to clear the church from all simony in the West, the Catholic emperor was employing the most unjust and unchristian means of clearing her from all heresies in the East, that of persecution, and the most cruel persecution any Christian emperor had yet set on foot or countenanced. For by an edict which he issued to unite all men in one faith, whether Jews, Gentiles, or Christians, such as did not, in the space of three months, embrace and profess the Catholic faith, were declared infamous, and, as such, excluded from all employments, both civil and military, rendered incapable of leaving anything by will, and their estates confiscated, whether real or personal. These were convincing arguments of the truth of the Catholic faith; but many, however, withstood them; and against such as did, the imperial edict was executed with the utmost rigor. Great numbers were driven from their habitations with their wives and children, stripped and naked.

Such were the means by which people came to the unity of the faith in the early church. And it must be borne in mind that Justinian and other emperors did not declare any faith, - they simply enforced the faith which had been declared by the Catholic bishops and councils. And what was the declared faith and practice of the Catholic Church, in regard to the Sabbath and Sunday, in the time of this inhuman conduct of Justinian? Leo the Great was made pope a little less than a century before Justinian's execrable action in behalf of the Church. Of Leo, M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopaedia says:-

Leo I., saint and pope, surnamed The Great, noted as the real founder of the papacy.

He was the real founder of the papacy in this sense, that he did more than all his predecessors to subject all the churches to the authority of the Roman bishops; and Bower represents his course, in the accomplishment of this purpose, as dishonorable, unscrupulous, utterly unworthy of any one bearing the name of Christian.

0139

But it is enough that he put forth every effort to establish the papacy, that he should be sainted; it is this that covers all sins in their estimation. The character and position of Leo cannot but be appreciated in connection with the up-building of the Sunday institution.

The Bibliotheca Sacra has an article on the subject of the change of the Sabbath, written by Rev. L. Coleman, author of "Ancient Christianity Exemplified." In this he speaks as follows:-

The reasons for keeping the first day in preference to the seventh, have already been stated from Justin Martyr. They are more fully explained by Leo the Great, of the fifth century. On this day the world had its origin. On the same day, through the resurrection of Christ, death came to an end, and life began. It was upon this day also that the apostles were commissioned by the Lord to preach the gospel to every creature, and to offer to all the world the blessing of salvation. On the same day came Christ into the midst of his disciples, and breathed upon them, saying, Receive the Holy Ghost. And finally upon this day the Holy Ghost was shed upon the apostles. So that we see as it were an ordinance from heaven evidently set before us, showing that on this day, on which all the gifts of God's grace have been vouchsafed, we ought to celebrate the solemnities of Christian worship.

This is, indeed, a very important document - important because of the position of the author; of the influence he exerted over the Church, which, as we here see, is not lost even to the present day; important as most fully explaining the reasons for keeping Sunday, not one of which the Scriptures ever noticed; important as an example, showing how an ordinance from heaven can be deduced from a papal "as it were." And if such respect is paid to these words of Leo the Great, pope, in this century, by leading Protestant publication in America, what must have been their influence, their force, when Leo had supreme control over the faith of Christendom, and was backed by the authority of the emperors. In the entire absence of evidence from the Scriptures, in favor of the Sunday institution, what can we think of the knowledge or frankness of a man who will affirm that not an item of history can be produced to show that the papacy changed the Sabbath?

As decisive as is this evidence, it is not the strongest that we have to offer. Historians, early and late, of all beliefs, have made much mention of the action of the

0140

Council of Laodicea, A. D. 364. Of this fact Eld. Canright is not ignorant. For charity's sake we could wish that he were. It is not pleasant to have to present that which convicts one who makes so large profession of both piety and knowledge of stating as a fact that which is so clearly and abundantly proved to be not true. M'Clintock and Strong make the following statement:-

Chrysostom (A. D. 360) concludes one of his Homilies by dismissing his audience to their respective ordinary occupations. The Council of Laodicea (A. D. 364), however, enjoined Christians to rest on the Lord's day.

This puts it very mild indeed. In regard to the influence of the decisions of this council, they say:-

Sixty canons were published, which were accepted by the other churches.

In their synopsis of these, they say:-

Canon 29 forbids Christians' observing the Jewish Sabbath.

In these two statements we get the whole truth. 1. It enjoined the observance of first day of the week. 2. It forbade the observance of the Sabbath. Let it be remembered

that this council was held in less than half a century of the time when Constantine issued his first decree, for the first observance of the venerable day of the sun as a day of rest from labor. As the historian says, it was taken from the hands of the emperors by popes and councils, and rest enforced upon it as a Christian festival. I am happy to be able to give the most definite information on the action of this council on this subject. I will here give three versions of this celebrated canon. First the original, as given by the council itself, in Latin:-

Quod non oportet et Christianos Judaizare, et in Sabbato otiari, sed ipsos eo die operari: diem autem Dominicum preferentes otiari, si modo possint, ut Christianos. Quod si inventi fuerint Judaizantes sint anathema apud Christos.

The following is the German translation as given in Bishop Hefele's "History of the Councils:"-

Dass die Christen nicht Judaisiren und am Sabbat nicht unussig sein, sondern an diesem Tage arbeiten sollen; den Tag des Herrn aber sollen sie besonders ehren und wenn möglich

0141

an demselben nicht arbeiten, wenn sic aber als Judaisten erfunden, so sollen sie von Christus ausgeschlossen sein.

The following is an English translation:-

Christians ought not to Judaize, and to rest in the Sabbath, but to work in that day; but preferring the Lord's day, should rest, if possible, as Christians. Wherefore if they shall be found to Judaize, let them be accursed from Christ.

There is no necessity that I should take another step to establish fully my propositions. It is abundantly proved, beyond all chance of denial, that the first law of any kind for resting from worldly labor on the first day of the week, was that of Constantine, who commanded only certain classes to rest upon it as the venerable day of the sun, in conformity with his worship of Apollo, the sun god. And in less than half a century after that time, a Catholic council enacts a canon which was accepted as orthodox, which not only contains the first formal church law for the observance of the Sunday, but likewise forbids the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath, under penalty of being accursed from Christ! Now, if any one can imagine what would be changing the Sabbath, if this is not, I would be extremely happy to learn what it could be. In less than half a century after Constantine's first Sunday decree, we find this sweeping canon of the Council of Laodicea. In less than a century after the publication of this canon, Leo the Great gave his decision in the most emphatic terms, that Christians ought to rest on the Sunday and not on the Sabbath. And in less than a century after Leo's decision, Justinian subjected all, whether Jews, Gentiles, or Christians, to the Catholic faith, of which the substitution of the Sunday for the Sabbath was a prominent part, of which they had to make a public profession within three months, under penalty of being declared infamous, excluded from all employments, rendered incapable of leaving anything by will, and having their estates, of whatever nature, confiscated.

Now, it being clearly shown that a part of the Catholic faith to which they were subjected, under such severe penalties, was, that people should not rest on the Sabbath,

and that they should not work on the Sunday, is it a wonder that, under the canons of councils, the decisions of popes, given under penalty of being ac-

0142

cursed from Christ, and enforced by the edicts of emperors, under such penalties as were rigorously inflicted by Justinian, - is it a wonder that the observance of Sunday became so prevalent throughout the empire? Is it not rather a wonder that so many clung to the Sabbath of the Lord, even in those perilous times, as history attests there did, in spite of the terrible persecutions to which they were subjected? And is it not still more wonderful that Protestant ministers, with all these facts of history within their reach, will gravely point to this prevalence of Sunday-keeping as evidence of the united faith of the Christian church in favor of the first day Sabbath? And most wondrous of all, a minister comes forward and informs the public, in all apparent seriousness, that he has left the Sabbath of the fourth commandment for a more pious observance, because that after very extensive research for more than a score of years, he has learned that Sabbatarians have never been able to produce an item of reliable history to prove that the Catholic church changed the Sabbath; that all we have to offer to prove or to defend our faith, is the evidence of the Catholic Catechism! Who can add a comment worthy of such an occasion as this? I appeal to Eld. Canright himself, if it is a cause for a professed Protestant minister to glory that keeping the Sabbath was not then a success, considering the circumstances under which Sabbath-keepers were placed by the papal authorities.

While I have fully proved my proposition, I have presented but a tithe of the evidence that is ready at my hand. And while Eld. Canright might not have been well acquainted with the true state of the case as the facts show it to be, he could hardly be ignorant of what Coleman said in reference to the Council of Laodicea. In "Ancient Christianity Exemplified," p.531, he says:-

Christian emperors confirmed and extended these decrees. All public shows, theatrical exhibitions, dancing, and amusements, were strictly prohibited. Similar decrees were also passed by various councils, requiring a faithful attendance upon public worship, and a strict observance of the day, by solemn suspension of all secular pursuits, and abstinence from amusements and vain recreations. The Council of Laodicea, canon 29, about the same time forbade the observance of the Jewish Sabbath.

0143

Coleman is an ardent advocate of Sunday, but he has presented the most incontestable proof of the truthfulness of our position. And in these statements he has only spoken in harmony with all history, as Eld. Canright ought to know, and surely would know, if he had searched the subject as diligently and thoroughly as he professes to have done. Let us mark well the words of Coleman. Speaking of the imperial decrees, he adds: "Similar decrees were also passed by various councils, requiring a faithful attendance upon public worship, and a strict observance of the day," etc. These were church laws, compelling the strict observance of Sunday, and faithful attendance upon public worship on that day, and holding an ecclesiastical curse over those who kept the Sabbath; and this action was taken by various councils; and yet all this, in the estimation

of Eld. Canright, does not amount to a single item of historical evidence that the Catholic Church put away the Sabbath of the Lord God, and elevated the Sunday of paganism in its stead.

It is a historical fact that the edict of Constantine, and the imprecation of the Council of Laodicea, and the letter of Leo, and the cruelties of Justinian, and other like contemporaneous acts, all together were not successful in entirely overthrowing the observance of the Sabbath, and in making the observance of the Sunday universal. Against this almost overwhelming tide of worldly power and influence and wickedness, witnesses for God's downtrodden commandment were constantly rising up. This is made clear by the action of subsequent councils, even if we had no other testimony. But for the present we will notice further the interesting period from Constantine to Justinian.

Sylvester was bishop of Rome during most of the reign of Constantine. He decreed that Sunday should be called the Lord's Day. But this could affect the Church of Rome only; for the bishop of Rome had not then yet attained to any authority whatever above the other bishops. True, while the mystery of iniquity was working, and countless superstitions were being introduced, especially in the African churches, this day was called the Lord's day, before the time of Sylvester; but his order was the first authority for calling it so. And now, in considering another decree from Constantine, I wish to call especial attention to the frauds which have

0144

so long been practiced - and are still, not only among Catholics but Protestants as well - concerning the application of this title of Lord's day. Eusebius, Life of Constantine, says:-

He enjoined on all the subjects of the Roman Empire to observe the Lord's day, as a day of rest ... And since his desire was to teach his whole army zealously to honor the Saviour's day which derives its name from light, and from the sun, he freely granted to those who were among them who were partakers of the divine faith, leisure for attendance on the services of the church of God, in order that they might be able, without impediment, to perform their religious worship. With regard to those who were yet ignorant of divine truth, he provided by a second statute that they should appear on each Lord's day on an open plain, near the city, and there, at a given signal, offer to God with one accord a prayer which they had previously learnt.

It has not been my lot to see the decree concerning the prayer to be recited by his pagan soldiers; though Eusebius gives the form of the prayer, which was well adapted to pagan soldiery! Nor have I thought it of sufficient consequence to search for it, if indeed it exists. But the reader might easily infer from the words here quoted, that Constantine did really give some order in regard to the Sunday under the title of the Lord's day, though he confesses it derives its name from the sun. We shall see if he did.

Reference has often been made by many authors to Constantine's edict concerning the emancipation of slaves on the Lord's day. Coleman says:-

No sooner was Constantine established upon the throne, than he began to bestow special care upon the observance of the Lord's day. He required his armies to spend the day in devotional exercises. No courts of judicature were to be held on this day; no suits

or trials in law prosecuted; but, at the same time, works of mercy, such as the emancipation of slaves, were declared lawful.

These words of Coleman are not marked with that accuracy that should mark the words of a faithful historian. It was not as soon as he was established upon his throne that he began this work. His victory over Maxentius was in A.D.312, and his first edict for a partial rest on the sun's day, was in 321. Requiring them

0145

to say a prayer, which is contained in a few lines, and contains not a single element of Christian faith, can hardly be said to be requiring them to spend the day in devotional exercises. Neither did he bestow "special care upon the observance of the Lord's day," - no, not any care whatever. Every reader knows that his edict of March 7, 321, had no reference to the Lord's day, but to the venerable day of the sun, which had long been known and venerated as the day of the sun by the pagans. If he did indeed say anything in behalf of the Lord's day, the reader may suppose that it was in his second edict - that which referred to the emancipation of slaves. Again I say, We shall see.

Of this decree I have a copy, together with an "interpretation" thereof, as found in the Justinian Code. I will give the interpretation first, as follows:-

Interpretation: *Quamvis sancta die Dominica omnes lites ac repetitiones quiescere jusserimus, emancipare tamen ac manumittere minime prohibemus, et de his rebus gesta, confici pari ordinatione permittimus".*

(Cod. Theod. Lib.II. Tit. VIII. de Feriis. Lex I. - Baron. Annal. Tom III., p.232.)

"There!" exclaims the friend of Sunday; "now we have it from the most unquestionable historical data, that Constantine did indeed issue a decree in favor of the Lord's day by name; for this is his decree, coming to us through high authority. Here are the very words - *sancta die Dominica*, the Lord's holy day. This justifies all that Eusebius, Coleman and the other numerous first-day writers, have said concerning Constantine".

And is it, then, so great cause of rejoicing that Constantine, who was confessedly a pagan at that time, called the Sunday the Lord's day? One might think that they had found a divine warrant for so calling it. But let us look further; perhaps the facts may cut off even this morsel of consolation. Fortunately for the truth of history, the original edict of Constantine has been preserved. In the work which now lies before me, immediately before the interpretation copied above, is the edict itself, as follows:-

Imp. Constantinus Aug. Helpidio.

Sicut indignissimum videbatur, diem Solis, venerationis suae celebrem, altercantibus jurgiis et noxiis partium contentionibus

0146

occupari, et a gratum ac jocundum est, eo die, quae sunt maxime votiva compleri. Atque ideo emancipandi et manumittendi die festo cuncti licentiam habeant, et super his rebus actus non prohibeantur. PP.I.V. Non Junii Caralis, Crispo II. et Constantino II. Coss. (A Chr. 321)

And thus it is, that that which, in the interpretation, and in the writings of "Christian historians" almost without number, is the "sacred Dominical day," is, in the original, the very plain, old-fashioned pagan, diem solis! Not upon Baronius, nor the compiler of the Code, nor Justinian, nor altogether of the Dark Ages, does the responsibility of this deception rest most heavily; but upon those professed Protestants of this enlightened age, who perpetuate the deception, and leave the word of God, and take their rule of faith and practice from the words of heathen emperors and the man of sin, the son of perdition. I will notice one more like instance.

Morer was a writer of the Church of England. His book, "Dialogues on the Lord's Day," was written to vindicate their forms of church worship, especially the observance of Sunday. On page 257 he undertakes to show "the piety of all ages in this particular, and the care they had to have the Lord's day kept," by declaring "the Canons, Decrees, Edicts and Laws," in behalf of the day. He proceeds thus:-

I begin with the Emperor Constantine, who, as soon as he had espoused the interest of Christianity, made it his particular business that his subjects should reverence this Festival, and so he issued out this decree: "Let all Judges, Citizens, and Tradesmen rest upon the venerable Lord's day. But for such as live remote in the country," [etc.]

Perhaps the first edict of Constantine was not so well known in Morer's day as it is in ours, and his mutilation would not attract much notice. Dishonest as it manifestly is, it is in perfect keeping with "the piety of all ages in this particular," for the Sunday Sabbath is a fraud at best, and nothing but fraud can give it even the appearance of an institution entitled to our respect.

The occasion is worthy of a little reflection. All history attests that Constantine was a devoted worshiper of Apollo, the sun god. Suppose that he had issued a decree directly in favor of the worship of Apollo, by that name, what would be thought of the historian who, suppressing the name of Apollo, should refer to this

0147

decree as evidence that Constantine commanded the worship of the Lord, the true God? One of two things we should have to conclude, namely, that the historian could not distinguish between Apollo and the true God, or else that he had perverted the facts to serve a purpose. But the advocates of Sunday have not scrupled to ascribe to Constantine the honor of bestowing "special care upon the observance of the Lord's day," when there is not in existence a word of evidence to justify the assertion; his only care was for the venerable day of the sun - a heathen festival day. Yet not a few Protestant ministers in America gravely assert that Constantine made a law forbidding that desecration of the Christian Sabbath! They treat his language as they do the words of Scripture. They affirm that John alluded to the first day of the week when he said, "I was in the Spirit of the Lord's day," though they have never even offered a particle of proof that John, or anybody else in his day, thought of applying that title to the first day of the week.

But the mutilation of history and of the edict of Constantine is but a small matter, compared to what the author of Sunday worship has led its advocates to do in its behalf. From his heathen edict they have struck the venerable day of the sun, which, aside from its object, would be no offense at all, and inserted the Lord's day in its stead. From the

infinitely higher edict, the law of Jehovah himself, they have struck out both the name of the Lawgiver, and the subject of the law. They have cancelled the words, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," and substituted a day which never was, and cannot be, the Sabbath day of the Lord, - a day upon which he did not rest from his work, which he never sanctified and blessed, and which he never commanded man to keep.

It is due to the reader that I give a translation of Constantine's second Sunday edict, and of the interpretation. Realizing that there are difficulties in these old Latin documents, I procured a translation from the professors of Basel University. I will give their translation as they gave it, in German:-

Wie es als höchst unwürdig erscheint, den Tag der Sonne, an sich feierlich und ehrwürdig, zu Zankreden und leidigen Parteistreitigkeiten zu verwenden, so ist es lieb und werth, an diesem Tag das allerwünschenswertheste auszuführen. Deshalb

0148

soll allen gestattet sein, an diesem festlichen Tage frei und los zu lassen, und niemand soll an Verhandlungen darüber verhindert werden.

Auslegung. Obgleich wir befohlen haben, dass am heiligen Herrntage alle Fragen um Mein und dein und sonstige Rechtsforderungen ruben sollen, verbieten wir doch keineswegs frei und los zu lassen und gestatten zugleich durch diese Verordnung die Verhandlungen hieruber in Ausföhrung zu bringen.

As it appears most unfitting to employ the day of the sun, in itself solemn and venerable, for controversies of noxious party strifes, so it is agreeable and fitting to carry out on this day that which is most of all desirable. Therefore all should be permitted on this festival day to set free and let loose slaves, and nobody should be hindered in transactions pertaining thereto.

Interpretation: Although we have commanded that on the holy day of the Lord all questions concerning mine and thine, and all other law claims should rest, we by no means forbid to set free and release slaves; and at the same time permit by this ordinance to carry out transactions pertaining thereto.

But it has been assumed with much confidence that the claim that the papacy changed the Sabbath is unfounded, even admitting that there was no law for resting on Sunday before that of Constantine; for the papacy did not exist until after that law was made, and therefore the law antedated the papacy.

As far as the Sunday Sabbath is concerned, this assumption does not help it at all; unless its friends would value it more highly from the hands of paganism than from the papacy. But the statement is open to two grave objections. It was Constantine himself that laid the foundation of the papacy. Bower minutely details the order of the hierarchy, its divisions, and the orders of its officers, as established by Constantine, making it an ecclesiastical government closely modeled after the civil. Although the exarchs and metropolitan bishops were over all the bishops in their dioceses and provinces, there was no one bishop over all. Yet it was declared by the Council of Nice that the primacy should rest in the bishop of Rome, in honor of that city. The title was then an empty one, except in the honor of the name; but it became fruitful both of dignity and power. The bishop of Rome soon became the representative of the faith of the church. To be in harmony with Rome was

to be orthodox; disagreement with Rome was heresy. But the bishop of Rome had to be governed by the councils. Constantine also made the bishop a civil magistrate, and allowed the Church to obtain possessions of lands.

A certain writer well observed that Constantine would have proved himself a noble ruler if he had rested with the acts of toleration of Christianity; but he followed this up with acts of intolerance against all Christians but those who happened to enjoy his favor, who composed that party which could best serve the interests of the empire. This party, of course, was represented by the bishop of Rome; for it would have been absurd to think of best serving the empire by conferring the primacy on any bishop but that of the imperial city. It was Constantine who convened the Council of Nice, where the famous creed of the Church was formed. Thus was laid the foundation of the papacy, or papal hierarchy.

But the most decisive objection that I bring against the assumption herein noticed is, that Constantine did nothing whatever that can be construed into changing the Sabbath. This is important ground, upon which we are strongly fortified, as I propose to show. There is absolutely nothing to give the least color of plausibility to the assumption except the words of Eusebius, wherein he says that "we" have transferred the duties of the Sabbath to the Lord's day. But he gives us no hint whereby we may judge to whom the "we" refers; not does he produce a single act of anybody which can possibly be construed into such a transfer. He speaks of Constantine's care for the Lord's day as evidence of his great interest in Christianity, - a declaration in which there is not a particle of truth. The "Encyclopedia Britannica" justly says of Eusebius:-

He was undoubtedly more of a courtier than was becoming in a Christian bishop, and in his Life of Constantine has written an extravagant panegyric, rather than a biography, of the emperor.

Considering the character of Constantine, the adulations of Eusebius are anything but pleasing to the Christian reader. Of the disposition of the bishops, who were intoxicated with the favors they received from the emperor, to flatter him, Neander says:-

One of them congratulated him, as constituted by God as ruler over all in the present world, and destined to reign with the Son of God in the world to come.

When such flatterers state what Constantine did in behalf of Christianity, we must ask to have the distinct actions set forth, and then we must judge by the actions, and not by the statements. Concerning the matter in question, the action is entirely wanting, and the statement is extravagant. The statement contains the first idea of the transfer of the duties of the Sabbath, but no evidence of the change.

Now we will consider what Constantine did, and the bearing of those actions.

1. It is proved that the law of Constantine was the first law enforcing rest on the Sunday; and as Dr. Schaff says, it was made in accordance with his worship of Apollo, the sun god.

2. It enforced rest on the judges, artisans, tradespeople, etc. of the towns or cities. But it had no regard for classes, - no relation at all to the professors of Christianity. It was in no sense a law of, or for, the church.

3. It did not restrain from labor in the country; and there, as in the cities, it had no regard for classes. In the towns it forbade all labor, whether by pagans or Christians. In the country it permitted all to labor, both pagans and Christians.

4. Constantine, in his decrees, said not one word either for or against keeping the Sabbath of the Bible. To this he did not refer in any way. Let not the reader suppose that he may have spoken concerning this in some other decree. I have now on my table a compilation of all the imperial and kingly decrees concerning the Sunday, compiled directly from the Codes, given in the originals. But two decrees of this nature are set down to Constantine, and these are both given in this article. The second was made in June, 321, as an explanation or modification of the first.

5. In the time of Constantine, Bishop Sylvester ordained that Sunday should be called the Lord's day. But of labor or rest on that day, he did not speak.

It is safe to affirm that there was nothing done in the time of Constantine, either by himself or any other, that has the least appearance of changing the Sabbath. It is said that he advised to have nothing in common

0151

with the Jews; perhaps he did, but it is certain that he did not refer in any way to the Sabbath in any law. It would have been well for the church and for Christianity if they had feared the Jews less, and refused to have anything in common with the pagans.

Constantine died A.D. 337. The date assigned to the Council of Laodicea is A.D. 364, 27 years later. The canons of this council were accepted by the churches (vide M'Clintock & Strong), and have always been considered Catholic. This was a church assembly, an ecclesiastical congress. Did it do anything that appeared like changing the Sabbath? - It did. It required Christians to rest on the Lord's day, meaning Sunday, and forbade them resting on the Sabbath under penalty of being accursed from Christ! - the severest penalty that they could pronounce. It peremptorily required the keeping of the Sunday. If that council had had supreme power, and had avowed its intention to change the Sabbath, what could it have done more than it did in this canon? And if Eld. Canright yet denies that this was changing the Sabbath, will he please to frame a canon that would have had the effect to change the Sabbath, - an improvement on this canon 29 of Laodicea? I would very much like to see him make the attempt. Now, I claim that I have completely met his demand; I have shown the time, the place, and the power that changed the Sabbath. And to make this matter sure, this voice of the Council of Laodicea has met a continual response from the Catholic Church in all ages, as it is easy to show. Charlemagne did more than any other emperor to make this part of the faith of the Church effective, and in his first decree he referred directly to this canon of the Council of Laodicea.

Here I will notice that some capital has been made of the expression in this canon that they should rest on the Sunday as far as they were able, as if it was not peremptory. This is but a thoughtless cavil; for we must remember that there was a law of the empire that permitted labor in the country on Sunday, and over this law the council had no

control. If Christians were under service in the country, to unbelieving masters, they could not rest from labor on the Sunday. The mandate was peremptory as far as the power of the Church could reach.

0152

In this manner the matter stood for several centuries. The law of Constantine was the law of rest for the empire, and the canon of Laodicea the Sabbath law or law of rest for the Church; though the Sunday did not for many centuries bear the name of the Sabbath.

For the sake of brevity, I will pass over the decrees from the time of Constantine to that of Leo the Great. They were all in effect similar to that of Constantine, taking notice of a few particulars as occasion seemed to require; but none of them made any restriction on Sunday labor, they left it just where he left it. As for the Church, everything was done that "Christian emperors," kings, popes, councils, synods, could do to uphold the canon of Laodicea, and add to the sanctity of the day of the sun. As to the canon itself, that could not be improved. It required them to "rest as Christians." All that was added, was to specify how Christians should spend the day.

The letter of Pope Leo I., and the decree of Emperor Leo I., demand special notice because they have received so much attention from Christian writers.

And first of Pope Leo. Justin Edwards, in his so-called "Sabbath Manual," says:-
Leo, Bishop of Rome, in behalf of the Church, about the year 440, said, "We ordain, according to the true meaning of the Holy Ghost, and of the apostles as thereby directed, that on the sacred day, wherein our own integrity was restored, all do rest and cease from labor; that neither husbandmen nor other person on that day put their hands to forbidden works," etc.

Of this quotation I some time stood in doubt; for (1.) I knew that Justin Edwards was not a careful writer; in this case he gave no reference to any authority, making himself responsible for the statement. (2.) The opening words were scarcely such as would be used by a bishop in that age, even one as assuming as Leo was. (3.) The bishop of Rome had no authority to forbid what the law of the empire permitted; for the law of Constantine, permitting husbandmen to labor, was still the law of the empire. Against these reasons, I had no sufficient evidence that Leo I. was the author of these words. As Leo of Thrace came to the throne several years before Pope Leo died, it seemed reasonable that they had been confounded, and the words of Leo the emperor had passed for those of Leo the pope. And the probability

0153

seemed strengthened by the fact that Morer gives part of these words substantially to the emperor, Leo I., in his decree of A.D. 469.

But the difficulty was not thus solved; for on examining the decree of this emperor, these words were not found there! Dr. Heylyn, more accurate than the others, has given the truth in the case. They are in a decree of Leo, surnamed The Philosopher, who came to the throne of Constantinople in A.D. 886. Therefore their date is four centuries and a half later than that assigned to them by Justin Edwards!

At first glance it may be thought of not much importance to identify the source of these words. But it is; for thereby the fact is revealed that labor by husbandmen on Sunday was not forbidden in the fifth century, as they would have us believe who assign the words to the Leos of that century. The decree of Leo the Philosopher, about the end of the ninth century, was the first authority suspending country labor on Sunday in the Eastern empire. He reversed that part of Constantine's decree because, as he said, "The fruits of the earth do not so much depend on the diligence and pains of the men, as on the efficacy of the sun, and the blessing of God."

Having cleared away this mist, we come to what the Leos of the fifth century really said. And first, Pope Leo the Great. This pope did not, as might be supposed from references often made to him, give two several orders concerning the Sunday. Nor was the Sunday itself the subject of his celebrated letter. The subject was the conferring of holy orders; the time best adapted to this service, he decided was Sunday. He gave two reasons for this selection; the first is not noticed by those who quote him, though it is of equal interest with the other. And first, he says their minds were already solemnized by the fast of the Sabbath; he cited Acts 13:3, to show that the apostolic practice was to set apart to sacred offices by fasting and prayer; he required that, on such occasions, the usual Sabbath fast should continue until the evening or till the Sunday morning, that both the person to be ordained and those officiating might come to the service with sober minds. This is the first reason. The second is, that the Sunday itself is most fitting for such a service; and here follow the words that I have copied in the quotation from

0154

Coleman - only with this difference, that Coleman closes his quotation with the words, on this day "we ought to celebrate the solemnities of Christian worship," thus making it general, whereas the letter itself closes with reference, not to the solemnities of Christian worship in general, but to the solemn services of ordinations.

It is interesting to notice that in this celebrated letter Leo twice uses the word "Sabbath" as the day of fasting, and calls the following day Sunday. He does not call it the Lord's day.

Dr. Schaff says: "The passage of Leo (Ep. IX., etc) which Hessey has chosen as the motto for his work, is the most beautiful patristic expression concerning Sunday." It is a fact worthy of special notice that the learned Hessey, in his "Bampton Lectures," preached before the University of Oxford, on "The Origin, History, and Obligation of the Lord's Day," took his motto from the letter of Pope Leo I. This is another proof - and they are not few - that it is not an idle boast of the Catholics that the Sunday festival is that institution by which the Protestants do homage to the Catholic Church. American Protestant authors are not slow to render the same homage by quoting this letter as the best presentation of the reasons for keeping Sunday. But his reasons are all outside of any revelation given in the Scriptures. They are devised of the heart of man. How different is the case in regard to the Sabbath. Ask a Sabbath-keeper for the best presentation of the reasons for keeping the seventh day, and he will turn to the Bible, - to the commandment spoken by Jehovah himself. It is "the holy of the Lord, honorable."

This letter of Pope Leo was dated A.D. 445. The edict of Emperor Leo was dated 469. In some respects it was the most important that was given up to that time. But here

I must digress to show the actual position of the emperors in relation to the Church, lest their edicts be supposed to have a secular aspect merely.

Eusebius, in his "Life of Constantine", B. IV., ch.24, says that in his hearing the emperor thus addressed a company of bishops:-

You are bishops whose jurisdiction is within the Church; I also am a bishop, ordained of God to overlook whatever is external to the Church.

0155

Constantine considered - or at least affected to consider - himself ordained of God to order matters pertaining to the Church, no less than the bishops themselves. No doubt the flattery of such courtly bishops as Eusebius helped on the conceit. And it was for this reason that he called the Council of Nice, and took such a leading part in its deliberations, though personally he had never allied himself to Christianity. And this position he bequeathed to his successors, - a position which the bishops were only too glad to accord to the emperors; for all the glory of the emperors, in this respect, tended to their own aggrandizement. It was greatly to their personal interest, and most of all to that of the bishop of Rome, to keep the Church in close union with the State. But in order to this, it was necessary to recognize the right of the emperor to order matters in relation to the Church. For many centuries no general or important council was called except by the emperor, or with his consent. Hence the custom of calling them "Christian emperors;" and their right to this title did not depend on their private characters, or their personal relation to Christianity.

The emperor, Leo I., who is called the Great, was not lacking in political sagacity, and thinking, no doubt, to add thereby to his dignity in the eyes of the people, he was crowned by the patriarch of Constantinople. This was the beginning of what proved to be one of the most dangerous prerogatives claimed by the Church. Of course, Leo was zealous for the advancement of the orthodox faith, and took decided ground in favor of the Sunday. Some have inferred, and for it they have only inference, that the decree of Leo was wider in its scope than those which had preceded, because of the severity of the penalty which was attached. His words were:-

If any will presume to offend in the premises, if he be a military man, let him lose his commission; or if other, let his estate or goods be confiscated.

He did not restrict that labor that was allowed by Constantine; and Heylyn proves, by facts in the history of the times, that his decree largely referred to those things which should have been prohibited on every day of the week. And moreover, his edict did not refer to the Sunday alone; for thus it ran:-

0156

It is our will and pleasure that the holy days dedicated to the highest Majesty, should not be spent in sensual recreations, or otherwise profaned by suits of law, especially the Lord's day, which we decree to be a venerable day.

Separating from the Pope and Emperor Leo, of the fifth century, all that has unjustly been assigned to them, we do not find in the letter of the one and the decree of the other, nearly as much as they are generally supposed to contain. Were it not that the

letter of the pope has been so freely used as the most beautiful expression in behalf of Sunday, and offered as the best presentation of the reasons for keeping that day, there would be nothing of special interest in it.

Having written thus much, and considering that the matter of Leo the Great has been so greatly misunderstood, I think I could not do a better service to the reader in this connection, than to give him the benefit of a translation of this letter of Pope Leo. It is from an authorized and commended edition of the letters of the popes in German. It is No. IX. of Leo's letters, and is in two chapters; but the second chapter relates altogether to the mass, and that is of no interest in this discussion. It is as follows:-

Leo, the Bishop, sends to Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, Greeting:

What great love in the Lord we cherish for your love, you can gather from this, that we wish to establish more firmly the beginning of your office, in order that nothing may be wanting to the perfection of your love, since, as we became convinced, the merits of spiritual grace attend you. The fatherly and brotherly conferring (of the office) must accordingly be most desirable to your holiness, and be so received by you, as you see it proceed from us. For we must be one in thought and action, in order to verify what we read (to wit), that we have one heart and one soul.¹ "For inasmuch as Peter received from the Lord the apostolic primacy, and since the Roman Church adheres to the institutions of this apostle, it is not to be supposed that his holy disciple Mark, who was the first to lead the Alexandrian church, shaped his institutions in accordance with other rules, for undoubtedly did the spirit of the disciple and that of the master both draw from one and the same fount of grace, and the ordained could teach nothing else but what he received from who ordained him." (7 Decret. cf. C. XXIV. qu.I, c. 16.)

1 Acts 4:32.

0157

We do not therefore suffer that we, who indeed profess the same faith in one body, should differ in anything from one another, nor that the institutions of the disciples should be distinguished from those of the teacher.

I CHAPTER. On which day the consecration of priests and Levites is to be held.

That which therefore, as we know, has been observed by our fathers with a devoted care, we wish to know to be likewise cherished by you; namely, that the consecration of priests and Levites be not undertaken on any day indiscriminately, but that (for this purpose) after the Sabbath day, the beginning of that night be chosen in which the morning of the first day of the week begins to dawn, when the ones to be consecrated, fasting, will receive the holy consecration by those who (themselves have) fasted. But the rule will even then be observed, when the consecration will be given, under a continuation of the fasting of Saturday, on Sunday morning, from which time the beginning of the preceding night is not distant, which no doubt, as becomes evident from the Passah of the Lord, belongs to the day of the resurrection. (8 Decret. cf. D. LXXV.c.4.) For besides the authority of custom, which evidently springs from the teachings of the apostles, the Holy Scriptures¹ also state very plainly, that the apostles, at the time they sent Paul and Barnabas by command of the Holy Spirit to proclaim the gospel among the heathen, laid their hands upon them by fasting and prayer, in order that

we might know with what devotion the one giving and the one receiving it must take care, lest a sacrament so rich in blessing should appear to be performed thoughtlessly. For this reason you will observe the apostolic institutions in a devout and commendable way, when you observe this rule in the ordination of priests, in the churches over which the Lord has made you overseer; namely, that the one to be ordained receives the consecration solely and only on the day of the resurrection of the Lord, which, as you know, begins from the evening of the Sabbath, and is made sacred by so many divine mysteries, that whatever of greater prominence was commanded by the Lord, took place on this exalted day. On this day the world had its beginning; on it, through the resurrection of Christ, death found its end and life its beginning (9 Decret. cf. D. LXXV.c.5); on it the apostles received their commission from the Lord to proclaim the gospel to all nations, and to dispense to the entire world the sacrament of the regeneration. On it, as the holy evangelist John testifies, the Lord, after he had joined the assembled disciples by closed doors, breathed upon them and said:

1 Acts 13:2,8.

0158

"Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins you retain, they are retained." On this day, finally, came the Holy Spirit, which the Lord had promised to the apostles in order that we might recognize, as it were, inculcated and taught by a divine (heavenly) rule, that we are to undertake on that day the mysteries of the priestly consecration, on which all gifts and graces were imparted.

How much has been drawn from this letter that is not justified by its words, the reader can judge for himself. Though it is made almost the gospel of Protestant Sunday-keeping, it certainly was not written to prove that it is a day of general observance.

I have already noticed that there was no specific law in the Eastern empire against Sunday labor in the country, until the decree of Leo VI., called the Philosopher, near the close of the ninth century. I do not speak of the effect that may have resulted from the general enforcement of the Catholic faith; but only of Sunday law. In the West this work began with the third Council of Orleans, AD. 538; and it is an interesting fact that this council, which was first to give a decision in favor of refraining from labor in the country on Sunday, gave as the reason that the people might attend the services of the church, and also proceeded to mitigate the rigors of the observance of the day which many had superstitiously thrown over it. But from this time forward there was a greater restraint placed upon Sunday labor, and the severity of the penalties was greatly increased. The emperors and kings, being the guardians and actual heads of the churches, were often most forward to advance the Sunday cause, granting even more than the church dignitaries had asked in the way of legal exactions; but there was little modesty on either side in this respect, for the history of the enforcement of Sunday and of opposition to the Sabbath, is one of remorseless cruelty, from the very time when the Council of Laodicea showed the true spirit of the papacy in its curse upon Sabbath-keepers.

And it was not Sunday alone that was thus cared for; "other festivals of the saints" were enforced with no less rigor than was Sunday, and they were justly classed together

in imperial and church action. And they were so classed together by the Reformers. Coleman gives the following testimony to their faith in this respect:-

0159

The Augsburg Confession classes the Lord's day under the same category as Easter, Whitsuntide, and the like; merely human ordinances.

The Reformers were deeply versed in the history and literature of the church, and were well qualified to judge whether the Sunday Lord's day was an institution of the papacy. Speaking of the Puritan idea of a Christian Sabbath, Coleman further says:-

The law of the Sabbath was indeed a religious principle, after which the Christian church had, for centuries, been darkly groping. Pious men of every age had felt the necessity for divine authority for sanctifying the day. - Anc. Ch .Exemp.,p.533.

Yes, and as far as any divine authority for sanctifying the Sunday is concerned, the necessity is no less deeply felt at the present time. This is manifested by the straits into which they are brought to defend the day; the contradictions which abound in the arguments of its advocates; the frauds by which it has been popularized, which are endorsed even in this enlightened age. And this is a most striking confession from Coleman. It is strange indeed that the piety and erudition of almost fifteen centuries, from the time of the apostles to the rise of the Puritans, had not succeeded in discovering the law of the Sunday-Sabbath, if such a law existed by divine authority.

The papacy is always best prepared to meet such emergencies, and this was met in its own peculiar way. In the year 1201 was produced the law, in the form of a letter sent down from heaven. Absurd as was this pretense, and ridiculous as was the law itself, it had more to do with establishing Sunday-keeping on a permanent basis in England and Scotland, than any other cause. And Protestant churches are eating the fruits of this shameful deception at the present time.

And this law did not stand alone. Miracles, such as the papal Church always has on hand for times of need, were freely produced in the line of terrible calamities which befell those who neglected to obey this letter, in not keeping Sunday and the other festivals of the Church. But the want of truly divine, of scriptural, authority for keeping the Sunday-Sabbath, still remains.

From this flood of falsehood and wickedness of worldly power, we turn, as has been said, with just satisfaction to the record of

0160

the Sabbath of the Lord, and to the means of its proclamation. Its history is untainted by deception, unstained by crime. No contradictions, no subterfuges, are found in its advocates. Resting upon the broad and solid basis of the commandment of God, it needs no emperors, no popes, no councils, to add to its dignity, its sacredness, or its authority.

Although I have noticed but a small part of the edicts, canons, exactions, and especially of the penalties, with which the history of Sunday abounds, I have done all that is necessary to meet my present purpose. I did not propose to give an extended view of these matters; it is enough that I have furnished the most incontestable proof that the Catholic Church, and it alone, changed the Sabbath. And I will repeat what I affirmed,

that of all the unscriptural institutions foisted upon the church, none is so distinctively papal as the Sunday-Sabbath, - the preceptive rest of the so-called Lord's day. No other institution of human origin can so clearly be traced to the papal power. If any one doubts this statement, I shall be pleased to see a comparison of evidences instituted. If this were not the case, - if other traditional precepts could be more clearly traced to that source, - that would not invalidate a single point of my argument. Whatever may be said of other innovations, our position stands strong; our proof is clear and well defined. The question, Who changed the Sabbath? is sufficiently answered.

And now I appeal to the reader; of all the proofs presented, how much have I relied upon the Catholic Catechism? Who that reads the mere culling of proofs that I have furnished, can give any credit to the statement, that Sabbatarians, in searching 200 years, have not been able to find an item of reliable history to prove their position, - that their sole reliance is the Catholic Catechisms? I truly pity the man who has had the ability and the opportunity to read, who can find it in his heart to make such a reckless statement.

It will be noticed that Eld. Canright, in his article, "Who changed the Sabbath?" entirely concealed from his readers the arguments and evidences which have been presented by the advocates of the Sabbath. And I ask him to give me the credit of following his example. All the testimonies that I have presented, all the decrees or canons of councils, all the edicts of emperors, all historical statements, are from the pens of

0161

those who were not favorable to the Sabbath. And while I have given but a small part of the evidence of this kind, what an array is presented! How can the friends of Sunday withstand the facts and the evident conclusion? Any one can answer this question who has read Eld. Canright's articles. It is no lack of charity to say - for it is only truth - that he has concealed the facts, denied or belittled the great and truthful, and magnified the insignificant and conjectural. His whole pretended argument is the weakest kind of sophistry. Not a single sound principle of just reasoning is advanced; not a single plain truth of the Bible is vindicated; not a single comprehensive view of history is taken, in all his argument.

I will draw this article to a close by giving a summary of the historical points compiled from a recently written history.

The Sunday is not mentioned by this name in the Old Testament, neither has the day under the name of the first day of the week in that book received any prominent place; and it was not appointed a rest day at all through any law before the year A.D. 321. The old name of the day, which was afterward christened, is the day of the sun; yet this name does not originate from the creation of the sun, since the sun was made on the fourth day of creation.

At the dawn of creation it introduces the week, but the account does not give it any higher rank than the other days, ... Our Sunday meets us from the very beginning as a common day. With the last day of the week, the seventh, it is somewhat different. Of this it is said with emphasis: "And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God

blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made."

The day of our Lord's resurrection is indeed a commemorative day, which will never be forgotten or passed by in his church; but from this - as one may think - it does not follow that we should give up the Sabbath, which God himself has ordained, and plainly pointed out at creation, nor that we should move it unto any other day of the week, because that day is a commemorative day. To do this we need just as plain a commandment of God declaring that the first day is repealed. But where do we find such a commandment? It is true that no such a commandment is found.

0162

In the laws of the state we afterward find the prohibition against Sunday work further and further extended, and the people threatened with more and more punishment if they disregarded it. Besides the giving of laws, we also find a new theological doctrine concerning Sunday: That Sunday-keeping is founded on the Sabbath-keeping which God ordained through Moses. Yet this doctrine does not seem through all the sixth century to have become a definite dogma in the church.

If we try now to collect that which may be learned from history concerning Sunday and the development of Sunday-keeping, then the sum is this: Neither the apostles nor the first Christians nor the ancient councils have marked the Sunday with the name and mark of the Sabbath, but the church and scholastic doctors of the Middle Ages have done this.

1. That Sunday is not the Sabbath of the Old Testament, and that this is not the common belief in the Christian church; but it is rather a mistaken idea, that the Sabbath should be changed from the seventh to the first day of the week.

2. That keeping Sunday with rest from labor and divine worship, has not by the most renowned ancient Fathers been founded in the Sabbath of the Old Testament, neither reference to the Sabbath of the Old Testament entered into the confession of the church before the sixth century after Christ.

3. That this doctrine first arose in the papal Church, that Sunday-keeping is commanded in the third commandment, and that the essential and prominent part of this commandment is a decree from God; to wit, to keep a holy day once a week.

Some may question the correctness of the statement here made, that the doctrine that the fourth commandment requires a seventh part of time, and is so far moral, and not the particular day, which was ceremonial, had its origin in the Catholic Church. Coleman says that Dr. Bound was the first to promulgate this doctrine, in a book published in 1595. But Coleman was certainly incorrect in this, for the same doctrine was taught by Thomas Aquinas more than three centuries before Dr. Bound, and Dr. Heylyn attributes it to the school-men of the Middle Ages. It is found distinctly stated in the Catholic Catechism entitled, "Abridgment of Christian Doctrine." There is no room for just doubt that they who argue thus - and the majority of Protestant Sunday-keepers do so argue - are following the lead of the papal doctors. When this writer says that the Sunday is not the Sabbath of the Old Testament, he means that it is not required by, or does not grow out of, the Sabbath commandment in the Old Testament.

From the decided tone and substance of the above extracts, it may be thought that I have now entered upon a new line, and given the conclusion and the summary of some advocate of the seventh-day Sabbath. But not so. The expression "our Sunday," shows its origin. This is copied from a work, "History of Sunday," by Rev. A. Grimlund, lately a Lutheran bishop of Norway. And the work itself was written to counteract the influence of Sabbath teachers, and to vindicate the action of the church in retaining a practice so well established by custom. Why, then, if such was his object, did he give such an overwhelming testimony against the Sunday, and so strongly vindicate the Sabbath? In return, I ask, How can any one give a genuine history of Sunday and do otherwise? All honest historians - and of such I take Rev. Grimlund to be one - are compelled by the facts of the Bible and of history to defend the Sabbath and to condemn the Sunday. Their theological opinions and associations may lead in another direction; their choice might be of another conclusion; but that other conclusion they can never reach by any fair treatment of the Bible and of history. In their cases we are reminded of the prophecy of Balaam. He started out to serve the king of Moab, and to curse Israel; but the Spirit of God turned it into a blessing. Balaam, though his heart was not in union with the message of the Lord, was not yet entirely left of the Lord to follow his own way. And so of these: they are not in sympathy with the commandment of God; they start out to serve the Sunday; but the truth of God turns their witness into a vindication of the Sabbath. And I here state it as my firm conviction, that when an individual, who has ever been instructed in the truth on this subject, can no longer find evidence in the Bible to support the Sabbath of the Lord, and can find evidence in history to uphold Sunday, it is because the Spirit of the Lord, the Spirit of truth, has left him to his own way, to walk in the way of his own heart's devisings.

I will here answer a question that has been proposed; it is said the Reformers, represented in the Augsburg Confession, and other authors quoted, were no-Sabbath men; they held that the Sabbath was entirely abrogated, and that it has no divine substitute in the gospel. In giving their testimony, do you not bind yourself to accept their conclusion, and to reject the Sabbath altogether?

Or, why accept them in statement and deny their conclusion? In answering this, I can but express my surprise that the questioners do not perceive any difference between a historical statement of fact, and a theological opinion. In accepting the history of Neander, I do not thereby bind myself to accept his theology. To be consistent, the questioners must reject the history of Gibbon, or turn skeptics. The Reformers were all raised in the bosom of the Catholic Church. They were piously trained from infancy to regard the seventh day as a Jewish Sabbath, and to call the Sunday the Lord's Day. Now, as to whether the Saviour abolished the ten commandments, and with them the Sabbath, is a theological question; it is only a matter of Scripture interpretation. In that we think the Reformers retained a grievous error of their early training; but that does not invalidate their testimony in regard to a matter of fact with which they were well acquainted.

In closing these remarks, I wish to say to the reader that I have quoted very little from history that has not already been quoted by the advocates of the Sabbath; while I have left unnoticed a vast amount of historical testimony that is well known to the readers of the writings of the Seventh-day Adventists and the Seventh-day Baptists. When Eld. Canright says that the Sabbatarians, in searching 200 years, have not been able to find an item of proof that the papacy changed the Sabbath, much of the reflection was intended to fall on the Seventh-day Baptists; for they, and not the Adventists, have been advocating the Sabbath for 200 years. But if he has any knowledge of the authors and the literature of the Seventh-day Baptists (and if he has not, he is without excuse), he knows that his assertion does great injustice to that denomination. Amongst their authors are numbered men eminent for ability, for education, and for deep research, not to speak of their evident piety and conscientious regard for the truth of God's word. They have laid before the world a large amount of rich instruction from the Bible and from history on this important subject.

Now if I had exhausted the evidence, if no more historical proof could be given than I have given in this article, even then I could confidently appeal to the reader that Eld. Canright's assertion is made in sheer recklessness. Many of his friends have marked for years, with much

0165

regret, this tendency in him to make confident assertions where proofs would have served a better purpose; but never was a word more carelessly spoken than this, that Sabbatarians have never presented an item of historical evidence that the papacy changed the Sabbath. I know that I have not a particle of personal feeling in the matter, but I do not know how to palliate such a statement coming from one who has read Eld. J. N. Andrews's "History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week."

I have avoided complicating my argument by noticing minor or incidental points. All minor points and objections can be easily met, but it has been my object to keep the main issue in view. And it is, in every sense, a main issue. Eld. Canright did not exaggerate when he said that we consider this a material question. We do indeed so consider it. And with the clear evidence before us that the papacy did change the Sabbath, and the fact that the Sunday institution will in every feature meet the description of such an institution in Rev.13:11-17, and that no other will, we are constrained to believe - we cannot avoid it - that the Sunday-Sabbath is the burden of the awful warning found in Rev.14:9-11. This is an issue that every one will have to meet. It cannot always be turned aside with empty assertions. In the providence of God it is going to every nation, and men can do nothing against it. I trust that the Lord will make this present effort on the part of Eld. Canright the means of awakening inquiry, and of bringing the truth yet more clearly before thousands who will weigh the arguments with candor, and conscientiously make their decisions. Let men oppose as they may, God's counsel will stand; his law will be vindicated; it will be victorious; the call of the prophetic word will be heeded, and a company will take their stand on "the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus," who will be permitted to rejoice when the Son of man appears on the great white cloud to reap the harvest of the earth. Rev.14:12-16.

CONCLUSION

Nature and Progress of Our Work

In this, the closing article of this pamphlet, we wish to present a few considerations for the reader's perusal, concerning the character of the work itself and its present outlook. In doing this it will also be proper to glance at a few historical facts connected with its past history.

S.D. Adventists have most firmly believed from the very feeblest beginnings of this movement, that they had a special message for the people, based upon the sure word of prophecy, - a work of vast importance to mankind. Believing, as they do, that the end of earthly things is "near even at the doors," they believe with certain assurance that a message of warning must go forth to the world calling the attention of their fellow-men to this solemn fact. They cannot conceive how the merciful Creator could bring the terrible destruction so often threatened in the Scriptures upon the race of man, and give them no opportunity of being warned of their danger. This is clearly inconsistent with the character ever ascribed to the great God in his own word. It is utterly contrary to his past dealings with the race of man. Whenever any just judgment has been impending, God has mercifully warned those exposed to it, by sending devoted servants with messages of truth announcing the fact. So it was with the antediluvians and Sodomites, and with the Jews before either the destruction of Jerusalem occurred or they were carried into captivity. So, also, it was even with the Gentile city of Nineveh. It matters not that such messages were unpopular and unheeded at the time, as they always were. It made no difference if the great majority utterly rejected the God-given warning. God showed his interest for man, and sought to save him. His character for love and mercy must be maintained, whether men hear or forbear.

We utterly reject the foolish notion entertained by the orthodox churches that Christ will come the second time, and the mass of mankind be exposed to terrible ruin, and they have no knowledge, nor a chance to obtain any light concerning this great event; but that like a clap of thunder from a clear sky, it will overtake all mankind without the slightest premonition. It is absurd and unscriptural. No reasonable person would pursue such a course toward those who were dependent upon him; and God is certainly as considerate as man. The Bible brings to view clearly this fact, that before the great day of wrath shall come, a warning shall be given. Christ declares: "But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." Matt.24:37. Did not Noah have a message of warning

to deliver? Then we must expect one before Christ comes. "So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand." Luke 21:31. Signs are here given which are immediately to precede his appearing, and be sure evidence of it. It were absurd to suppose that those warned of it would not warn others.

Paul says: "But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief." 1Thess.5:4. "That day" is when Christ comes, as the immediate connection shows. These brethren who have light will give that light to others. Says the prophet Joel: "Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain: let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand." Joel 2:1. We believe that when the time comes, the alarm will be sounded as the word declares. The prophet Zephaniah, in chap. 2:1-3, brings to view the same thing. But the solemn message to be proclaimed is most fully brought to view in Rev.14:6-12. The most thrilling announcement in all the Bible is here made. The terrible destruction to be visited is here distinctly portrayed. The character of the work to be done is plainly indicated. Christ's coming in glory is here brought to view.

S.D. Adventists fully believe that God has called them to proclaim this warning message to the world. They feel a woe is laid upon them if they prove unfaithful. They dare not do it. They feel there is one special work committed to their hands by the God of heaven, and they must be true to their allegiance and discharge their solemn duty. And though, as men who fear God and love humanity, yet fealty to their God-given, special work they are ever bound to show. They must be true to that, and sound the warning to earth's remotest bounds. They realize, of course, that those who hate their work will be inclined to take advantage of this fact, and will endeavor to show that S.D. Adventists care nothing for others, and are indifferent to the many important reform movements and efforts sought to be advanced by good and faithful souls in the world around them. But they utterly deny these conclusions. They do love all that is good, and seek to show an interest in the same as far as they can without neglecting the special work of warning the world of coming judgments, which God has committed to them, and they have assumed.

The very nature of their work requires of them an interest in all good things. Their platform of divine truth is a broad one: "Here are they that keep the commandments of God and the

0168

faith of Jesus." Rev.14:12. This embraces all the great moral truths of the old dispensation and the precious things of the new.

The truths of this message, therefore, are not some new doctrines, novelties just discovered, but rather a going back to the "old paths", a restoration of precious truths lost through apostasy, but necessary to be restored to the people of God that they may be in readiness when Christ comes. It would be folly to suppose that when he comes in his glory he will find his people quarreling among themselves, holding various discordant doctrines, some of them received from heathenism and apostasy, and neglecting the truths taught by him. When he comes, he will find a people without "spot or wrinkle, or any such thing;" yea, "without fault before the throne of God." Rev.14:5. S.D. Adventists are free to admit they are very far from meeting that standard yet; but they believe that when the "shaking time" shall have accomplished its work in the great trials just before us, there will come forth a faithful company through whom God will work with mighty power, who will meet this standard.

The discerning reader, then, cannot fail to see in the very nature of their platform of faith, and in view of the principles of their doctrinal belief, that they are bound to be

interested in every good work existing among their fellow-men. Their reform is broad enough to embrace all other reforms. It rejects all evil; it accepts all good.

S.D. Adventists are perfectly willing that their record should be examined on this point by all candid persons who will weigh and consider all the circumstances. Such will find that intelligent members of this body have ever stood in the forefront of the reform movements of the age, so far as being loyal to them is concerned. The church was a unit in its opposition to slavery when nearly all the great popular religious bodies of the land were either divided upon the question or wholly sold to its support. Our people as a body are in advance of almost any other church in the land on the temperance question. Our membership are practically unanimous in favor of total abstinence from all that intoxicates, and for the prohibition of the liquor traffic. They carry the principles of temperance farther than any other people we know of in the world. Instead of confining it merely to intoxicating drinks, they teach its application to everything that is hurtful, as tobacco, opium, tea, coffee, etc. and have thus taught for a quarter of a century. They believe that everything that is injurious to the physical, mental, or moral nature should be cast aside. They are equally loyal, in their teaching, to the principles of social purity and all other genuine reforms.

0169

Yet they do keep in the forefront, and must ever do so while they exist as a people, the great truths of their special work of warning the world of Christ's soon coming, and the necessary preparation for it. Therefore they cannot give their principal attention to other objects, however worthy they may be, though deeply interested in them, and standing ready to assist whenever they can.

This attitude will displease those, of course, who have no faith in this special work, and who may be interested in the other reform work to which we have alluded. They will see no propriety in it. Regarding the doctrine of the soon coming of Christ and the Sabbath reformation with abhorrence, they will not look with favor upon those teaching these truths as a specialty, even if they do hold other points in common. They will dislike us for the reason that they hate that which we make so important.

Here is where our position as a people is exceedingly difficult and embarrassing. We are thrown, measurably at least, out of the fellowship and good will of those holding many reforms in common with us, because they dislike our special work. And we cannot, of course, expect the favor of those who are opposed to both our special work and the reforms we teach. The very circumstances of our position and the principles we teach, therefore, make us unpopular with the great bodies of our land. This is not something of our own choosing. But the principles we hold sacred as God's eternal truth, which we cannot ignore or disregard, and the attitude the religious bodies of the land assume toward them, force us into this position. We would gladly have it otherwise if it so pleased God. But as it seems inevitable that we should occupy this unpopular position, we accept it as our heritage, and meekly submit to the treatment which this position brings upon us. We must be faithful to our God-given work.

This position, of course, gives an excellent chance for apostates and other enemies to ridicule, and misrepresent, and malign us. We accept this also as our heritage. But we shall do our best to show up their wickedness when loyalty to the cause requires it, and

they stand in the way of the work, and seriously interfere with its progress, and endanger honest souls.

The special movement has existed about forty years, commencing a year or two after the great disappointment of the Advent believers in 1844. We regard that movement as a fulfillment of prophecy, and believe that it was in the order of God. Great power attended it, as even its enemies admit.

The present movement commenced in great feebleness, poverty, and perplexity. Never did a movement commence in this world which demanded more faith than this. It was under a

0170

terrible cloud of popular disfavor because it grew out of the "Millerite movement," as its enemies delighted to represent it. Its earlier advocates had all been in that movement, and shared in the disappointment.

Eld. Joseph Bates, Eld. and Mrs. White, and Eld. J. N. Andrews were among the first who discerned the harmonious system of truth now taught by this people. We then had no churches, no organization of any kind, no printing-offices, books, or papers, no colleges, no health institutions. All of these had to be created. We had then no experience in making converts to the faith, and indeed at first scarce a soul outside of the disappointed Advent believers could be found who would listen at all. The pioneers commenced their work by visiting private families, holding meetings of a handful in kitchens and barns, laboring every way under the greatest disadvantages. There were scarcely any among the earlier believers who had means above the barest necessities. The overplus had been spent in the Advent movement. But these pioneers had their Bibles and faith in God. They sought with strong crying and many tears to know his will and to understand his word. And gradually, link by link, the precious system of truth now held, was revealed in their minds. Gradually, as they proclaimed these truths, believers were added.

There has never been connected with this movement any great and special excitements, and large accessions coming in in large bodies. Its growth has been a healthy one, reached by thorough conviction of the truthfulness of our positions. The tremendous cross connected with the seventh-day Sabbath and the unpopularity of our work has stood in the way of multitudes embracing it at a time. People would never do so unless their understanding and conscience convinced them that they must. But this we can say, with all our hindrance, unpopularity, trials, apostasies, and pressure from without, there has never been a year since the work commenced but that there has been a gain; sometimes greater and sometimes less, but always a growth.

But it may be inquired, Have you ever had to meet, in the history of your work, opposition from those who have withdrawn from you, like this which Eld. Canright has lately inaugurated? - Oh, yes; instance after instance of it. We have never had an attack upon us before from such persons which has been so extensively circulated before the public as this, through the religious papers of the popular denominations, to distant portions of the earth. We have never had one to meet before which in some particulars was so unprovoked, and manifested such utter forgetfulness of past kindness, and showed

such ingratitude and determination to kill our influence before the general public. But we have had several which threatened

0171

far greater losses in membership than this has yet indicated. When these occurred, our people were far less in number and influence than now. Such attacks then threatened far greater proportional loss than this. We will mention a few as illustrations:-

In the early days of the movement, when we were very few in number, probably less than one thousand, Elds. Stephenson and Hall, of Wisconsin, withdrew from the ranks. They were persons of considerable ability and influence, and our numbers being so few, the loss at first seemed almost irreparable. Quite a following went with them. This interfered with the progress of the work in that section considerably for a time, and sent a shock through the little denomination which was seriously felt. But in a little time the growth was still more rapid. Wisconsin has since become one of our strongest Conferences.

Some years later, another split-off occurred in the State of Michigan. It was called the "Hope of Israel" party. It comprehended quite a following. They started a paper by that name, through which to pour out their feelings of bitterness. They attacked the visions and the reputation of Eld. and Mrs. White much as Eld. Canright does, and for a little time they seemed to make quite a stir. But they soon fell to pieces, like a rope of sand. Their paper went down. We believe there are a few of them left here in Michigan somewhere, but they have almost disappeared from view.

After a few years, Elds. Snook and Brinkerhoff, of the Iowa Conference, the one president and the other secretary of the Conference, and the only ministers of any kind in it, got into trial, came to a General Conference at Battle Creek, Mich., apparently all in harmony, and returned with evil reports, which they distributed from church to church in a manner not creditable. They soon had quite a commotion. Without entering into particulars, we will simply say, They both left our people, bitterly fighting us, published pamphlets in opposition to the visions and other points of faith, much after Eld. Canright's style, got possession of the type and press of the old "Hope of Israel" party, moved them out to Marion, Iowa, and for a time seemed to be quite a party.

They took with them, to the best of our knowledge, fully one third of the churches and membership of the Iowa Conference. Things looked rather dubious for that Conference for a little season, as not a minister was left in it. The two departing elders busied themselves going from church to church doing their utmost to tear down. But behold the results! In a few years that Conference had increased its membership threefold; it had a good corps of earnest, intelligent ministers in the field; and to-day it stands second or third in point of numbers and

0172

financial strength among our conferences throughout the field. Its growth was never so rapid as it was soon after this rebellion. Elds. S and B. soon gave up the Sabbath, and have since united with the Universalists. They long ago ceased to trouble our Israel. But

there has ever since remained a small residuum of that movement at Marion, Iowa, which publishes a little paper, and manages to keep alive by affording a channel of communication for the dissatisfied spirits who withdraw from our ranks.

Moses Hull, once quite a prominent debater and writer, also withdrew from our ranks, and became a Spiritualist. He fell very low in the scale of morality.

We might mention quite a number of lesser lights who have also retired from us into obscurity and darkness, but we do not care to disturb them by even mentioning their names.

What lessons have we learned from all this experience? - We have learned that this movement, like every other special movement of God's origination, is unpopular, and that there will be apostasies from time to time connected with it. Those whose faith fails them, or for whom the way becomes too strait, will withdraw, and try to make it hard for those who remain, endeavoring to destroy their confidence. There is always a fearful conflict connected with the special work of God.

Satan hates every such move, and will do his utmost to break it down. See how it was in Noah's time. Only eight souls were saved. How was it in Moses' time? - All but two of the adults failed to reach the promised land. Rebellion, murmuring, and every evil found a place among the people. The work of elevating human nature and training it up to a higher plane is one of difficulty, and many will not bear it. Hence sharp contention has to be met. God's special work is not a sluggish dormant Dead Sea; it is a sharp conflict with evil in every form. Even when Christ came, and "spake as never man spake," multitudes became interested but to turn back and "walk no more with him." John 6:66. Judas betrayed him, Peter denied him, and all "forsook him and fled." Paul met the same experience. Demas forsook him, "having loved this present world." He says on another occasion, "All they which are in Asia be turned away from me." 2Tim.1:15. Prominent men left him. Whole churches, like those of Corinth and Galatia, were almost ruined.

So it has ever been. Shall we therefore conclude our work is a failure because here and there men apostatize and turn upon us with hatred? - Oh, no! We will simply pity their blindness, then close the ranks and move forward in our work, fearlessly declaring the message God has given to us.

This present move does not alarm us. We are not sure but we should be better off if quite a number of half-hearted believers

0173

(of which we have quite a quantity) were purged out. To all such we say, If you cannot be converted, it would be better for you to withdraw. If you remain in this half-hearted condition, we can do you little good, and you certainly can do us none. We have found in the past, instance after instance, when the unbelieving have withdrawn, the work has moved forward much more rapidly. God then works for us, and makes up our losses.

We have also learned by much experience that this work is hard to kill. It is something like a wall four feet high and six feet thick; when you turn it over it is higher than ever. It seems to prosper with trial and scourging and defamation and opposition. A storm is better for it than a calm. It brightens up the old soldiers, puts new life into them, makes them more aggressive than ever. We rather need something of this kind once in a

while to scour and brighten us up and make us look at the old foundations, so that we shall feel for the pillars of the faith. Such times bring the loyal to the front and the cowards to the rear. We expect Eld. Canright's raid will, on the whole, be a blessing to us.

A few closing words as to the present condition of the work: The outlook was never so favorable before. This movement has passed its feeble stage, where it attracted the attention of but an obscure few. It is at the present time reaching its long arms around the world. Its enemies are getting exceedingly anxious as to how they are going to meet it. It has burst its swaddling bands, and like a strong young man is going forth to conquer new fields. It is not confined to little country places, back-woods settlements, and the farming community; but it is entering the largest cities, going to the greatest nations of the earth, speaking through the great papers of the world. Others are looking to see what kind of a work this people are doing.

There is one point connected with this raid of Eld. Canright's which has especially interested us. It is the eagerness with which his attacks have been received by leading religious papers and by the Protestant ministry even in Europe, Australia, and the most distant parts of the world. A brother in Europe writes that where our workers begin to attract attention in various localities, they are met by a host of quotations from Eld. Canright, our apostate "leader".

This at first sight might seem discouraging, but we are accustomed to look beyond the mere present to more distant effects. The fact simply shows that these ministers are put to their wit's end to know how to meet S.D. Adventists. Hence they hail with ill-concealed joy some help from Eld. Canright. He can, perchance, furnish them ammunition which they were

0174

not able to find themselves. What does this show? - Simply that our work is attracting the attention of people in the most distant parts of the world. What would these have cared for Eld. Canright had not their fears of "Adventism" made them anxious for help? But when they see the best and most conscientious of their flock becoming interested in the presentation of these Bible truths, and for their lives they know not how to meet their arguments, they begin to look around for assistance. Along comes column after column of defamation of this people, and statements showing them up in the worst possible light. Then, to be sure, they are delighted. Canright is a Godsend.

Well, let them make the most of him. We, however, only see additional evidence from all this that the influence of this work is already becoming great in the world. When our enemies are so anxious, why should we despond?

The present year has witnessed the greatest increase of our publishing work ever seen in the history of this cause. We are publishing in all the leading languages of the civilized world. We have very large offices of publication in Battle Creek, Mich., and Oakland, California; smaller ones in Basel, Switzerland, and Christiana, Norway. We also publish periodicals in London, England, and Melbourne, Australia. We have important centers of missionary effort in England, the Scandinavian countries, Central Europe, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand; and believers, more or less, in nearly all parts of the civilized world. The bulk of our membership is, of course, in the United

States. We have some twenty-nine organized State Conferences, and several others soon to be organized. Our colleges and city-mission training-schools are preparing workers more rapidly than ever in the past.

Some two thousand of our people are scattered in little companies in the Old World, in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Switzerland, Holland, France, Italy, Roumania, Russia, the Crimea, the Caucasus, and in the British Isles. These serve as a nucleus, - a center from which to distribute our literature, and from which to work for the conversion of souls. We publish about twenty different periodicals in the interest of this cause. We are having a reasonable and constant growth every year.

While we are free to admit that many among us are far from coming up to the standard of our Saviour's teaching and the truths we hold, yet even our enemies themselves who know us best, are constrained to admit we are an honest, devoted, conscientious people, and that our members are more devoted to religion, proportionately to numbers, than any people they know of in the world. Eld. Canright has admitted this.

On the whole, then, our work never looked so promising as

0175

at the present time. Its influence never was so great before. Its prospects of accomplishing the great work foretold by prophecy never looked so near a consummation as now. We feel sure the work will triumph in the end, because we see the hand of God in it, and because it has the sanction of his word. Therefore we have no cause for discouragement, but every reason to look up and lift up our heads, for our redemption draweth nigh. "The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his."
G.I.B.

TO THE READER

IN this pamphlet, we have spoken out earnestly and plainly on the subjects we have had in hand. But nothing has been set down in malice or ill-will. We have aimed simply to defend the truth, and this we cannot be blamed for doing when we see it attacked in a manner calculated to misrepresent it before the people, and mislead and deceive the honest. We have aimed only at the good of all concerned. And if the language in some instances should seem strong, we ask the reader to attribute it to our love for the precious cause in which we believe ourselves to be engaged, rather than to any desire to seem harsh or severe. Examine the truth on its own merits, and decide according to the testimony which it presents. And may God bless the reader with a discerning spirit and an obedient heart.

0177

PART SECOND.

ELD. CANRIGHT'S REJOINDER AND OUR REPLY.

0178

EXPLANATORY NOTE.

THIS pamphlet was written to meet a special demand. It was first published in the form of REVIEW AND HERALD EXTRA, Nos. 1 and 2, No. 1 appearing in December, 1887, and No. 2, in February, 1888. Large numbers of these were circulated in this form. To meet the present and future demand, it was thought best to place the first issue of the EXTRA in the form of a pamphlet. To this is added EXTRA No. 2, and hence they appear as Part I. and Part II. of this pamphlet. Part II. was written in reply to strictures which Eld. Canright made after reading EXTRA No. 1.

Eld. Canright has now given up most of the distinctive doctrines which he formerly held as a Seventh-day Adventist, and joined his interests with the popular churches which he formerly opposed; so they take much pleasure in circulating his writings as extensively as possible. As the matter in this pamphlet effectually refutes many of his statements and so-called arguments, it seems necessary to have it ready for use. It will, no doubt, be needed for some time to come. Should the matter contained in it seem to the reader to be in any wise uncharitable, and too combative, let him consider the nature of the attacks made upon us, and our long silence till forced to take up the unpleasant task of reviewing one who has represented us so unjustly. We dislike much this kind of warfare, but necessity sometimes compels it. We trust this may be the last time we shall be compelled to notice this attack. We hope this pamphlet will be the means of saving many from deception, and of opening the eyes of honest souls.

G. I. B.

0179

INTRODUCTORY.

THE readers of the REVIEW EXTRA* of Nov.22, 1887, containing the "Reply to the Attacks of Eld. D. M. Canright" upon Seventh-day Adventists, will remember the statement we made therein that we did not intend to publish anything further concerning him or his work. Having been forced by the publicity and virulence of his attacks, after long and patient waiting, on our part, to take up the defensive, notice him and his work, and reply to a few of his arguments and misrepresentations, we intended to leave the matter to the judgment of a discriminating public, and say no more concerning him.

But within the last few weeks we have received a document from him which he demands should be published by us, to correct certain "wrong statements" which he claims we made concerning him in the EXTRA. Of course, we ever hold ourselves ready

as honest men to correct every wrong statement we make concerning others which really injures them. And if it be true that we have done Eld. Canright an injury by anything we have said, we would cheerfully correct and acknowledge it. But we will consider that question hereafter.

We make this preliminary statement that the reader may see that the cause of our bringing him again before the public is his own demand upon us to do so. We should not for a moment have thought of doing it, but for his urgent request. Our attitude is still that of the strictly defensive. As we do not care to bring these personal matters into the regular issue of the REVIEW AND HERALD, it is thought necessary to publish a small EXTRA, No. 2. We now give Eld. Canright's reply to the EXTRA in full.

GEO. I. BUTLER.

* Let the reader bear in mind that the word EXTRA, occurring in Part II. of this pamphlet, refers to Part I., in harmony with the Explanatory Note on page 178.

0180

ELD. CANRIGHT'S REPLY.

Otsego, Mich., Dec.27, 1887.

EDITORS OF THE REVIEW AND HERALD:-

Brethren: Your EXTRA relating to myself has been read. Of course, things appear to me very different from what they do to you. I would like to point out many things which to me seem clearly erroneous; but I know you would not publish them if I did. Many of your statements with regard to me are not correct; in some cases only half the truth is told, and in others facts are omitted which would give a very different coloring to the matter. Still, from my long acquaintance with you, I cannot believe that you would knowingly make a false statement when convinced that it is wrong. Hence I ask you to correct two or three of the gravest ones, concerning which I can readily furnish the evidence. It was only a few weeks ago, that you felt greatly grieved with the editor of the Advocate because he would not, as you claimed, correct an offensive statement concerning your people. So I will now expect you to be willing to do me justice in this matter.

On page 2 of the EXTRA, Eld. Butler says:-

A little previous to the time of our camp-meeting [at Grand Rapids] Eld. Canright came to the city and visited most of the newspaper offices, to obtain the privilege of inserting articles in the city papers against us.

Then it is stated that, handbills were scattered by my agents (page 87) upon the grounds, etc. Neither statement is true. Two weeks before the camp-meeting, by urgent request I went to Grand Rapids, and met one of the men from the Democrat office at Dr. Veenboer's office. He said that the editors wished me to write a half dozen articles on the other side, as they had published so much from the Adventists that their readers did not like it. I agreed on six articles, for which Dr. Veenboer paid me. I came home the same day, and was not there again till after the camp-meeting. Dr. V., without asking me, had

some of the articles struck off and distributed on the grounds, which I should not have done. I did not visit a single newspaper office, nor ask any one to print anything for me. Here is the doctor's own statement:-

"Grand Rapids, Dec.27,1887.

"REV. D. M. CANRIGHT, Otsego, Mich.

"Dear Elder: I received an EXTRA of the REVIEW AND HERALD, dated Nov.22, 1887, in which Geo. I. Butler makes statements so utterly false that I wish you would call on him to retract and repair your injury done by his slander:-

0181

A little previous to the time of our camp-meeting, Eld. Canright came to the city [Grand Rapids], and visited most of the newspaper offices, to obtain the privilege of inserting articles in the city papers against us, etc.

"Now, all the work of opposition, `visiting newspapers,' `distributing handbills at the West Michigan Fair,' `scattering thousands of copies' of `Mrs. White, the prophetess,' at the camp-ground, was done without the knowledge or consent of Mr. Canright, except that I made arrangement once for a newspaper man to meet the Elder at my office, where arrangements were made to publish a half dozen articles on Seventh-day Adventism, by Eld. Canright. These articles were written by him at the urgent request of half a dozen of our ministers and some laymen. They were used by me and some of these men for the good of the cause of truth against the unbiblical doctrines of Adventism, at the Fair and camp-grounds, and in our daily papers.

MELLE VEENBOER."

This is enough on that point.

On page 15 is a statement from Bro. Butler, concerning my ordination, which is untrue and very unjust, both to myself and to the church with which I united. He accuses me of putting a padlock upon my mouth on the subject of the soul, insinuating that I sold my conscience and my liberty for a place in the church. Bro. T. M. Shanafelt, of Three Rivers, secretary of the Michigan Baptist State convention, was secretary of the council, and heard all that was said. Here is his testimony:-

"My attention has been called to a copy of the ADVENT REVIEW AND HERALD EXTRA, dated Nov.22, 1887. This EXTRA seems to be devoted exclusively to replies to Rev. D. M. Canright, now pastor of the Baptist church in Otsego, Mich., but formerly a Seventh-day Advent minister. Mr. Canright was ordained at Otsego, after a thorough and satisfactory examination by a large council which met at the call of the Otsego Baptist church, March 19, 1887. The undersigned was secretary of the council.

"In the copy of the REVIEW AND HERALD referred to, in the article entitled `O Consistency!' the following reference is made to Mr. Canright and the council that ordained him:-

We are also informed that in his examination before the council of Baptist ministers just before his re-ordination at Otsego last spring, when those points of faith involving the soul question came up, the Elder was meekly modest in his statements, and "wanted time" further to examine the subject before he felt inclined to state his positions.

And also that he was accorded a private examination by the council of divines on this question, the proceedings and result of which we have never been able to learn.

0182

"Neither of the above statements is true. The `soul question' was not discussed, and Mr. Canright was not accorded a private examination on that question nor any other. Such a proceeding, which is contrary to Baptist usage and custom, was not suggested nor thought of by Mr. Canright or any of the large number of ministers and laymen who composed the council.

"T. M. SHANAFELT.

"Three Rivers, Mich., Dec.23, 1887."

This states the truth exactly. Eld. Butler was misinformed on this point, as on many others. Simply one question was asked with regard to the dead, I think, or the resurrection, that was all. My Baptist brethren have accorded me the fullest freedom in preaching the Word of God as I understand it, and I have done so with all the freedom which I ever enjoyed among the Adventists, or could wish anywhere. If you think I am afraid to speak my mind on the soul question, give me two columns in the REVIEW, and you shall have it plainly.

Once more: On page 98 Bro. Smith accuses me of duplicity in writing differently for different papers. Does he find a line in one contradicting what I wrote in another? - No, only as he construes it so. But he says I dare not send to the Methodist Advocate a certain sentence on the abolition of the decalogue which I published in the Oracle, to the editor of the Advocate, and he wrote me, "Your article on Colossians 2 is very fine," and offered to publish it. Lack of space was all that prevented its publication entire. Abridged, it was published as article No. 11.

I believe you will have the fairness to correct these statements, which are calculated to injure my reputation as an honest man. I will try to profit by the lessons you read me in the EXTRA. I freely own myself to be a poor, erring mortal, liable to make sad mistakes, even when I try to do my best. The consciousness of my weaknesses often overwhelms me with discouragement, but I know I have tried to do what I thought was right. I try to show the same mercy and consideration for others which I hope for myself at the Judgement. I am not conscious of any hard feelings toward my former brethren, though I am well convinced that their doctrine is an error.

D. M. CANRIGHT.

ELD. BUTLER'S WRONG STATEMENT. - NO. 1.

IT will be seen from the above that Eld. Canright is so urgent to have us publish his article that he appeals to

0183

our sense of fairness to induce to do so. He calls to our attention the fact that the editor of the REVIEW demanded of the Advocate the correction of some grossly erroneous charges, which the latter never would correct. He evidently thinks we will be more fair than the Methodist editor, and we will justify his good opinion of us by publishing his statement. Those who are right can afford to be fair. The reader will see, then, that this publication is issued entirely because of the Elder's demand.

Eld. Canright claims that I have misrepresented him, and injured his reputation by statements which I made concerning his visiting the newspaper offices in Grand Rapids before our camp-meeting, and getting his articles into the papers, and having them scattered on the camp-ground. He says my statements concerning these things are untrue. He brings in a letter from Dr. Veenboer to substantiate his statements. The reader will carefully notice what the Elder and his ally have said. I will at this point also introduce a letter from Eld. H. W. Miller, who lived at Grand Rapids at the time, and acted as the agent of our Conference, securing space in the columns of the city newspapers for the publication of reports of our camp-meeting:-

Grand Rapids, Mich., Jan.31, 1888

ELD. G. I. BUTLER, Battle Creek, Mich.

Dear Bro: In reply to your letter of the 26th, I will say that about the first of September, 1887, I visited the editors and business managers of three of the leading dailies of this city, and made arrangements to report, through their papers, the proceedings of our camp-meeting, which was to be held in this city the last of September. Four or five days before our meeting proper was to begin, and during our preparatory meeting, two of these papers began the publication of a series of articles from the pen of Eld. D. M. Canright, which consisted not only of an unjust attack upon certain points of faith held by Seventh-day Adventists, but of a personal reference to certain leading writers and speakers of that denomination. Now, as the principal consideration in the matter of reporting our meeting was, that we should circulate several hundred copies of each of these dailies, we felt it duty to call and ascertain something of the articles we were about to circulate. We were informed by the managers of two of these dailies that arrangements had been made by Eld. Canright or his allies to have a series of articles from the Elder's

0184

pen appear in their columns during the week of our camp-meeting. And the business manager of the other paper told us that they had been urged to publish the same articles, but positively refused to have anything to do with it.

Whether Eld. C. personally visited these publishing firms is a very minor matter; but the evidence is abundant that they were visited by him or some of those who were intimately connected in the plot to secure the publication his articles in the papers of which we expected to circulate about 2500 throughout the State. As his articles were so full of a revengeful spirit, and consisted so largely of personal attacks upon those from whom he had so recently withdrawn, it took but little argument to convince those who had published a few of his articles, that justice to us, in accordance with or former

contract, would demand that they be discontinued, at least during the time we reported our meetings through their columns. Eld. Canright, however, was not well satisfied with all this, as was seen by the article he wrote and the strong effort he and his friends made to have it published in Sunday's issue of Oct.2. I was personally interviewed by the editor concerning the publication of this piece, and he being more honorable than the others, did not allow its publication in his paper of that date.

But Eld. Canright and his associates were not of the submissive kind; so they had the said article struck off in sheet form, and all day Sunday, Oct.2, their agents surrounded the camp, when thousands were in attendance, freely scattering these sheets. It was a very noticeable fact, however, that many of those who were doing this menial work for them, were so far down in the intellectual scale that they could not even read what they were giving to others.

H. W. MILLER.

This brings the whole question before us from parties intimately connected with the matter on both sides. Eld. Canright and Dr. Veenboer state that the Elder did not personally visit the newspaper offices, or engage in the circulation of these articles against us on the grounds, etc. Suppose we grant this to be true, as they state, - and we have no disposition to deny it, - what then is the result? And how far does it prove that we have treated him unjustly or misrepresented him? The facts admitted or proved are these:-

1. Eld. Canright knew very well that we were about to have a large camp-meeting in Grand Rapids, and that it was always our custom on such occasions to have full reports of the same in the leading city papers.

0185

2. He knew this Dr. Veenboer was a very bitter opponent of our people and doctrines, and that he would do everything in his power to make us odious in the eyes of the public.

3. Knowing this full well, as we have reason to believe there had been much correspondence between them, he came to this man's office, made a bargain with him to write six articles against S. D. Adventists, and placed them in his hands; and this man "paid" him for them, according to the Elder's own admission.

4. Somebody acting for this partnership of Canright, Veenboer & Co., did visit the three leading newspapers in the city, and two of them published articles for them, and one refused.

5. When our agent, Eld. H. W. Miller, visited these offices, and objected to being made a party to carry out this plot of forcing our people to circulate Eld. Canright's virulent articles against our faith, and slanders against our leading workers, these papers agreed to withhold the publication of them till the camp-meeting was past.

6. During the progress of the camp-meeting, just before the most important day of it (Sunday), the Elder wrote another article, not included in the six he was "paid" for. It was the most bitter of any of them. From expressions in it concerning the "camp-ground," we know it was intended to be circulated on the ground; e.g., "All of Mrs. White's books from which I quoted are at the camp." "Examine them and see if I haven't

quoted them right." The agents of the above firm, Canright, Veenboer & Co., brought a big pressure to bear, to get this into the papers. Failing in that, as Eld. Miller says, their "agents surrounded the camp, when thousands were in attendance, freely scattering these sheets."

These are the facts in the case. But now Eld. Canright feels he has been abused, treated unjustly, and misrepresented by Eld. Butler, because I said, "Eld. Canright came to the city and visited most of the newspaper offices," and that his agents scattered handbills on the camp-ground, etc. And his right-hand man, Dr. Veenboer, steps up and generously exonerates the Elder, taking all the responsibility upon himself. We do not wonder the Elder desires to shift the responsibility of such work as this, on to somebody. We are

0186

glad he has some sense of propriety yet left; but he will find it difficult to get rid of the responsibility, after all.

What is the difference in principle, whether a man does a mean act himself, or so associates, with other men that they do it for him, when the motive is transparent that he desires it done? The first course shows courage. The other looks more sneaking. But the responsibility inheres in either case. The principle is recognized everywhere, that responsibility rests as much upon a person when he acts through agents, as when he does a thing himself. The popes erected St. Peter's cathedral; yet we do not suppose they ever struck a blow upon it, or laid a stone. Vanderbilt built one of the finest mansions in New York, yet never drove a nail in it. Satan is the murderer of our race, yet perhaps never killed a man directly. But it is his influence which has led men to their ruin. Eld. Canright, in constant communication with Dr. Veenboer, visits him, writes some articles for him, gets "paid" for them, and places them under his control; and he cannot escape the responsibility of what follows. Eld. C. is neither a child nor a fool. He well knew what prompted Dr. V. to pay for these articles, and that he would do his utmost to make them hurt S. D. Adventists. And on the very face of it, one was written by the Elder to be circulated on the camp-ground; for it was directed to those on the ground, and they were told to "examine" certain books there. It was written with malevolent intent - written to break down before the citizens of Grand Rapids the influence of "Mrs. E. G. White, the prophetess." It speaks of her in a most scandalous way, implying that she was acting a double-faced, hypocritical part: "Her words will be smoother than oil." But her statement about the popular churches is "shamefully false."

We claim emphatically, that Eld. Canright intended to have these statements of his circulated in some way upon that camp-ground; and the very words of his own article, and all the circumstances connected with it, abundantly substantiate the truthfulness of this statement. He must either stand in this position, or deny the authorship of this wretched sheet which was circulated by the thousand on the camp-ground, on his "Sunday Lord's day." How much he knew as to just what the agents

0187

of this "partnership" would do, and just how far they would go, has little to do with it. When a man puts liquor to his throat, and goes off under its influence and murders a man, the law holds him responsible for his acts. He knew what sort of stuff that was before he swallowed it. He knew what kind of work it sometimes made men do when under its influence. So Eld. Canright, when he wrote such words and placed them in the hands of a man actuated by the spirit Dr. V. had, knew, or should have known, the use to which he would likely put them. A little dodge that he himself did not go to any printing offices, or personally hire any agents to go to the camp-ground and scatter this trash, has very little importance. He placed it in the hands of those whom he had every reason to believe would do it and, as the result proved, actually did do it. And he himself was really a party to the whole transaction, and got "paid" for his part of it. How could his responsibility be made more manifest. Why, on the same ground the writer could claim no responsibility in the circulation of the EXTRA, though he wrote a large part of it. He has no remembrance of circulating even three copies. Yet Eld. C. will hardly be likely to release him from responsibility in the premises. The Elder will have to try again before he convicts Eld. Butler of any substantial misrepresentation.

ELD. BUTLER'S WRONG STATEMENT. - NO.2.

I AM next charged with doing Eld. Canright and the Baptist Church great injustice by some statements made concerning his ordination. He says my statements are "untrue" and "very unjust." He says I accused him of putting a "padlock upon his mouth" on the "subject of the soul," and that he "sold his conscience and his liberty for a place in the church." Well, such charges do seem rather hard on such a consistent, conscientious man as Eld. Canright has proved himself to be, surely. He calls upon one of his good brethren in the Baptist ministry to help him out, and relieve him from the odium of my "unjust" charges. So the Rev. T. M. Shanafelt, secretary of the council which examined Eld. C. before his ordination, comes gallantly to the rescue, and declares two of my statements "untrue." "The soul question

0188

was not discussed" at all, he would have us believe, at the time of Eld. Canright's ordination. He had no "private examination" of any kind. This is wholly "contrary to Baptist usage and custom," he good secretary tells us. The Elder himself also kindly assures us that he has the most delightful liberty among his new associations in the Baptist Church, "to preach the word of God as he understands it." His "Baptist brethren have accorded him the fullest freedom in preaching." He assures us that when he was examined before being ordained, little or nothing was said on the soul question. "Simply one question was asked with regard to the dead" or "the resurrection; that was all." The Elder wants us to understand he has no "padlock on his mouth," as Eld. Butler has wickedly insinuated. He has the most perfect freedom to speak and teach what he pleases, "all he could wish anywhere." He says if we do n't believe it, and think he "is

afraid to speak his mind on the soul question," to give him "two columns in the REVIEW, and we shall have it plainly."

Surely, what more could we ask in the premises, and how consistent and suitable everything has been all the while between the Elder and the good old Baptist Church on this soul question. It seems almost a pity to try to exonerate myself in the least from the "injustice" I have committed in insinuating anything about that "padlock" on the Elder's mouth, when everything is so serene and perfectly candid and fair in this new, loving fraternal relationship between the and Elder and the good church of his choice, on the "soul question." But we all know human nature will do its best to absolve itself from blame, even if it has a poor chance. So we must made an effort:-

1. It will be noticed by the reader, in the extract Mr. Shanafelt quotes from me in the EXTRA, that I made no claim of knowing anything personally about the proceedings of the council examining Eld. Canright before his ordination, not being present. I only stated that I was "informed." This is true. I was so informed.

2. I intimated in the article in the EXTRA, entitled "O Consistency!" that the relationship on the soul question, between Eld. Canright, an ordained Baptist minister, and the church with which he was connected, was a very anomalous one, to say the least.

0189

3. I stated that he had been a man of very pronounced views on the question of the immortality of the soul and kindred topics, for many years, having been intensely opposed to the view that man by nature is immortal, and also to the doctrine of eternal torment.

4. I further stated that the Baptist Church, as everybody knows, held both of these views very strenuously in their creed; indeed, that the orthodox churches with whom Eld. Canright now affiliates regarded a belief in these doctrines as more important than many others they held, and denounced the views which the Elder had always advocated on this subject, as the most dangerous "infidelity."

5. That so far as I had learned, the Elder had never intimated in a single instance, publicly or privately, that he had changed his former opinions a particle on this subject. But on the contrary, considering the fact that he so bitterly opposed S. D. Adventists on the Sabbath, the law, the prophecies, and most other points of faith, but never did on the question of the soul and kindred subjects, we were authorized to believe he still held the views he always had on this point.

6. That it was a most inconsistent position for a church to employ a man as pastor over a congregation, to teach what it regarded as a great error, or refrain from teaching what it considered important truth, there being scarcely any question in the whole realm of Bible doctrine made more prominent or important than that relating to man's future. It is directly involved in the plan of salvation, and has an important bearing on the government of God; and Eld. Canright has ever taught that many of the most erroneous doctrines existing grow out of this one of the immortality of the soul.

7. In view of the ominous silence of both parties on this question, and the Elder's marked reticence concerning it, while we know he always used to have so much to say upon it, we intimated that he had a "padlock on his mouth," on the soul question, the

expression only implying that something remarkable had choked his utterance. He thinks this very unjust.

But what does he say to relieve himself or his church from this aspersion upon the propriety of their present relation? Why does he call in Eld. Shanafelt to state that certain remarks which I gave simply as second-hand

0190

information were incorrect? that he did not have a "private investigation," and was not asked concerning to soul question? This question was entirely ignored. There seems to have been a beautiful and harmonious understanding on this subject, and never a word said. There was such a sweet and perfect union of spirit on this interesting occasion when the Elder was to be ordained as a Baptist minister, that such little matters of theology as to whether countless myriads of men, women, and children were to be tortured to all eternity, or not, were not worth considering for a moment. It mattered not whether the soul was immortal or not, in the minds of this large council of reverend D. D's. No matter what the Elder thought about it, - whether he believed men go to heaven at death, or that man had no more soul than a brute. Such little matters were not worth asking a question about, if he was only to be made a Baptist minister. What is theology any way, and what does it amount to? And why should they ask him any questions at all, or hold any council over him? Wasn't the fact that he had left the poor, deluded "Advents" enough evidence any way to show he was all right? Truly the Baptists are a large-hearted people, and believe in great freedom, when they can take a minister so readily and so fully on trust, who has been under the corrupting influences and the "fanaticism" of this despised people for twenty-eight years, and never ask him a question upon the most important doctrines of their faith. It doesn't seem to be of much importance any way what a man believes or teaches, if he is only to join the church.

Now in all seriousness, we say it is very hard for us to believe this matter was left in any such loose way as the two Elders would have us believe. It does n't look sensible. All the facts seem to us to point rather to this conclusion, that there was a perfect understanding beforehand between Eld. Canright and some of these good Baptist divines, and that he was to keep mum on this subject. Very likely this was not made apparent on the surface. Such understandings are not usually blown out upon the world with a trumpet. They are more apt to occur in some very quiet, retired way. I have no idea that this understanding was reached in that public examination. Hardly; those doctors of divinity would not have been likely to leave their pleasant homes to come

0191

to Otsego, at large expense and inconvenience, until this matter was all well understood, And here is where the "padlock" question comes in. What evidence has Eld. Canright given us that he speaks his mind freely on this soul question? Why, forsooth, he will furnish the REVIEW, if we will open our pages, two solid columns of matter on this subject. Generous soul! In the first place, he knows we would not open our pages to him any way, so he is perfectly safe in making the statement. In the second place, we are in no need of enlightenment on the question, if he holds his old views. We are all sound on

that subject. But to give him a chance to show his sincerity and the "fullest freedom" to speak "the word of God as he understands it," let him speak his sentiments in his own church, where they need it so badly. Let him enlighten the Baptists on the horrible nature of eternal torment, publish it in their papers, etc., and see how much this "fullest freedom" amounts to.

Let the reader carefully peruse his present article, and tell us of a single hint, the remotest intimation in the whole article, as to what his views are on this subject. If this doesn't indicate the tightest kind of "padlock" on the Elder's mouth yet, then we are unable to judge. We dare the Elder to publish his views on that subject in any way that will tend to influence Baptist opinion; that is, if he still holds to his former opinions. We think it very probable he will, after long meditation, come out on the other side, and be an immortal-soulist. He has placed himself in a false position, and made such radical changes, that we are fully prepared for this. It will be no great matter to turn one more somersault for one who has proved himself so agile heretofore. Poor, poor man! what a pitiable spectacle his course for the last year presents! From our souls we pity him. He may call it "injustice," "misrepresentation," or what he will, he cannot conceal the fact that the attitude he has taken, and that of his church concerning the soul question, is anything but a proper one.

"O Consistency, thou art a jewel," applied to this matter, we know cuts close. But it is the truth in the case which furnishes the edge to make it cut. The effort to get rid of the force of what I said in the EXTRA, by calling attention to supposed errors in what I gave as information furnished by another, does not change the

0192

actual status. To all intents and purposes, the Elder's mouth has been "padlocked" on the soul question for a year past, to the very best of our knowledge. And the greediness with which these popular churches take up men for ministers who have been tainted so long with gross error, "fanaticism," "infidelity," as they claim Adventism to be, is most illuminating. It shows right on the face of it that they don't really believe that this doctrine injures people, corrupts their morals, or keeps them from being Christians. Their course shows unmistakably that they would be wonderfully glad to get all of us, if they could.

GEO. I. BUTLER

ELD. SMITH'S MISREPRESENTATION.

IN EXTRA No. 1, p. 14, appeared the following short article, to which Eld. C., as appears from this reply, takes great exception on the ground that it present him in a wrong light before the public. The body of the article consists of extracts from what he has written to different papers; and the name of the paper in which each quotation was published, and the date when published are explicitly given, so that any one can verify the quotations if he so desires. We ask the reader to compare again carefully these quotations, and judge whether it is not Eld. C.'s own words which have placed him in the

light in which he stands before the public, which to be sure is not a very enviable one. The article as published in Extra No.1 was headed, "All Things to all Men," and reads as follows:-

"We notice quite a difference in the tone of Eld.C.'s arguments, according to the views of the paper for which he writes. Thus, while writing for the Methodist paper, the organ of a denomination which has strenuously maintained the unceasing obligation of the ten commandments, he says:-

P.S.- Lest my position should be misunderstood before I have time to explain it, I will say here that I believe strongly as Sabbatarians do in the perpetuity of the holy immutable law of God, and every moral precept taught in the Old Testament. The Methodist Discipline (Articles of Religion, sect.6) exactly expresses my position on the law: 'Although the law given from God by Moses as touching ceremonies and rites, doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity be

0193

received in any commonwealth; yet, notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral.' - Advocate, Sept. 24, 1887.

"Now he knows, as all know, that the Methodist Discipline by the expression, 'the commandments which are called moral,' means the decalogue, the ten commandments, as they were spoken by God from Sinai, and written on the tables of stone. So the Methodists will get the idea that Eld. C. agrees with them in this, and so be much pleased. But when he is writing to an antinomian paper, as the Christian Oracle, of Des Moines, Iowa, instead of saying what s to be understood that no Christian whatsoever is free from obedience to the decalogue, he says that all Christians are free from it; for it has been nailed to the cross, and taken out of the way. Thus in the Oracle of June 9, 1887, we read the following from his pen:-

"The simple facts, I believe, are these: Paul [in Col.2:14-17] refers to the entire Jewish system, the law of Moses as a whole, of which the decalogue was only a small part. Every word of the ten commandments, Sabbath included, was written by the hand of Moses, on parchment, right in with the rest of the law of Moses. (See Deut.5, and other places.) As an entire system, as a law taken in all its parts, it was a burdensome system, a yoke of bondage, a school-master designed only to lead us to Christ. It was against us and contrary to us, and as such it was nailed to the cross. The decalogue being written on parchment in the book of the law, it would be proper to speak of it as blotted out, nailed to the cross, etc., with the rest of the law.

"Eld. C. would not dare address such language to the Methodist Advocate. If he did, it would not be published. This is being all things to all men with a vengeance. U.S. "

The article published in the Oracle, from which the foregoing extract is taken, Eld. C. says he did send to the Advocate, and the editor pronounced it "very fine," and promised to publish it if space permitted. Personally, the editor might have been willing to do this. He has come in contact with arguments in defense of the true Sabbath. He understands how grave the situation of the Sunday institution is becoming, and has endeavored to defend it. He might be willing to resort to any expedient,

even to the abolition of the whole law, to get rid of the Sabbath. We have before had occasion to note that the Sabbath controversy is forcing people either to accept the Sabbath of the Lord, or to retire to the "last ditch" of antinomianism; and some are making this latter move with great precipitation. But the consciences of the great body of the Methodist and Baptist denominations, have not yet reached that degree of depravity to which these men are trying to force them. And the influence of this fact is seen in the treatment of Eld. C.'s article by the Advocate.

As abridged, says Eld. C., the article appeared as number eleven of the series of articles in the Advocate. We look over the article, and what do we find? - Every plague touch of the virus of antinomianism carefully removed. All expressions to the intent that the decalogue was "a part of the Jewish system, the law of Moses, written by the hand of Moses on parchment right in with the rest of the law of Moses," that it was "a burdensome system," "a yoke of bondage," "against us," "contrary to us," and "nailed to the cross," and "blotted out," - all these expressions are carefully left out. Want of space is pleaded as an excuse for omitting these expressions. But these were the real gist and point of the article as sent to the Oracle. If the article must be abridged, why not take out some of the less important portions, instead of those vital and essential parts which show what his position really is, as it was published in the Oracle?

It is useless to claim that the position of the Methodists as expressed in their Discipline, on the law, is the same as that of the Disciples. It is equally evident that the readers of the Advocate, the Methodists, will understand that Eld. C.'s position is exactly like theirs, and the readers of the Oracle, the Disciples, will understand that his position is exactly like theirs. If this has come about so far as the Methodists are concerned, by suppression of those declarations which show his real position, then the editor of the Advocate has misrepresented him; and yet he utters no protest against being placed in this false light before the readers of the Advocate. Indeed, he takes the same position himself in that paper, in the postscript to his article in the Advocate of Sept 24, as already quoted. The Methodist Discipline

recognizes the distinction in laws, as ceremonial, civil and moral; and while the former are done away, the latter are immutable and perpetual; and this, Eld. C. says to the Methodists, "exactly expresses" his position. But to the Disciples, who do not acknowledge any such distinction, he says he believes it was an "entire system," a "law in all its parts," and all done away, nailed to the cross and blotted out. If these two declarations set forth one and the same position, it remains, at least to our mind, yet to be shown.

We said that he would not dare address to the Advocate such language as he addressed to the Oracle. But this he says he did do; and we will take his word for it. We added, however, this: "If he did, it would not be published." And this conclusion stands verified; for the Advocate would not, or at least did not, publish it. When Eld. C. will induce the Advocate to publish from him the statement that the decalogue, containing the

commandments which are called moral, has been blotted out and nailed to the cross, and call it "very fine," and induce the Oracle to indorse the position that "the law of God," the "commandments which are called moral," is a "holy and immutable" law, he will have done something toward proving that he does not designedly stand in a different light before the readers of those papers respectively. But then he would simply contradict himself in both papers.

U. SMITH.

"I HAVE TRIED TO DO WHAT I THOUGHT WAS RIGHT."

WE take the words here used as a heading, from Eld. Canright's closing paragraph in his article published in these columns. One might judge from the remarkable meekness of the Elder's closing words, that he was considerably reformed and somewhat ashamed of his previous performances, and that the castigation he had received through the EXTRA had brought him back to a more rational and consistent state of mind. We would that we could indulge in such a hope. None would more freely forgive than ourselves, could we see any signs of true repentance. But we have long since learned the difference between a "godly sorrow" which leadeth to true repentance, and a put-on outside appearance of submission and regret because of overmastering circumstances which

0196

have placed a person where he could not help himself for the time being. Such may appear to be quite meek till a more favorable opportunity is presented. The Elder evidently had a big tussle with that EXTRA. But he found himself so hedged about on every hand by the truthfulness of its statements, and his feet so entangled with the wicked inconsistencies of his own course, that the best he could do was to write this reply, claiming that we had done him injustice in a few instances, and closing up with some very lamb-like expressions concerning his "desire to be profited" by the "lessons read to him" in the EXTRA, and his sense of his own "weaknesses" which at times "overwhelms" him. Does he really cherish such sentiments? We would that we could believe it.

But, alas! since these words were written, we find he is out in different parts of the State not only repeating his former statements, but even going further than ever in his desperate efforts to injure S.D. Adventists, and misrepresent us before the public. We are therefore forced to believe that these words of his showing meekness and humiliation are but empty nothings, designed merely for effect, while in his heart he is determined to continue to wage this unjust war upon his former brethren.

But what about this statement, "I have tried to do what I thought was right"? Well, it is an astonishing one, to say the least. The Elder evidently realizes that his course has been such that no candid man knowing the facts would be likely to think he had done right. He must know that it was not "right". No wonder that the "consciousness of his weaknesses often overwhelms" him. But this "consciousness," alas! does not

become so firmly fixed that he changes his course. He has since engaged in the same work in a more aggravated style than ever. But we must not forget that all the while, according to his statement, he has "tried to do what he thought was right." We hardly feel like denying the Elder the slight satisfaction still remaining, in cherishing the bare "thought" that after all he had a little desire left to do right. It would seem cruel to wrench this from him. It would not look well on paper to charge him with being a hypocrite, and we should greatly regret to be obliged to come to such a conclusion, in view of our many former associations. We have long known that much allowance must be made for persons who have fallen into great darkness by a failure to live up to the

0197

light they have received, especially when that light has been very great. Light may seem darkness to them, and darkness light. The mind becomes perverted. The Saviour speaks of some who shall "hear, and shall not understand," and shall see, and yet "shall not perceive." Their "heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed." We are not to suppose they realized this themselves.

The apostle also speaks of a class who "received not the love of the truth." "They should believe a lie," and be damned in so doing. When the light in us becomes darkness, how great is that darkness! This is a sentiment we see demonstrated often in this world of changes. Here are principles brought to view which are constantly illustrated. When the light of God's Spirit is withdrawn from a man, and he plunges along with a desperate spirit of resentment against his former belief and companions, he is not apt to study his motives very carefully. Such may have thought they did right. It is very natural to take complacent views of ourselves. Go into any prison in the land, and ask the inmates about their former conduct, and how many of them do you suppose will be found who did not think they were about as good as most men? When reverence for the law of God is broken down, - that law which Paul declares is "holy, just, and good;" that law which is "spiritual," and searches the deep things of the heart, - we are left to form our own standard quite largely, and then it is the most natural thing in the world for a man to say, even when under grievous condemnation, if he used the highest standard of rectitude: "I have tried to do what I thought was right." So we feel bound still, under the necessities of the case, to grant this slight consolation to the Elder.

But let us notice a few points, and see to what lengths the Elder's conscience will let him go and still retain this hope that he is doing "right," that we may measure the present condition of his moral sense.

1. His treatment of old friends. As stated in the EXTRA, Eld. Canright at the time when he withdrew from us, professed the most pacific intentions. He said at Otsego, Feb. 17, 1887, before the church, that he thought there was a larger percentage of true Christians among S.D. Adventists than among any other denomination. He expressed the highest

0198

appreciation and confidence in many of our leading laborers; said he was perfectly satisfied with the treatment he had received from our people, and that he felt that he had

been used in all respects as well as a Christian should. His greatest sorrow was that he felt compelled to part company with us. He despised the course others had taken who had gone out from us, and then opposed and ridiculed us, and he would never do this. He would give himself wholly to revival work. He never would become a bitter assailant of our people. Yet within a few months he began the most bitter warfare upon S.D.Adventists which has ever been waged by any one. He has held us up to ridicule, and made us the laughing-stock of crowds for hours together. In his speeches, time and again he has done his best to cause us to be despised as a set of fanatics, narrow, bigoted, and unworthy of respect.

Think of it, candid reader. What could be the motives which would prompt you thus to treat old and long tried friends with whom you had labored and prayed, whose hospitality you had enjoyed, professing to love them so much - with whom you had lived in sweet communion as the dearest friends on earth for more than a score of years? After he had come to the point of finally parting company with us, he felt himself forced to say that he had no complaint whatever to make of our treatment of him. We had used him tenderly as a Christian in every sense. Yet he holds us up to ridicule, doing what he knows will wound our feelings most cruelly, when we have never done him an injury. We know he will try to find excuses for such conduct. But we showed in the EXTRA that he had none whatever, and in his reply he finds no fault with the EXTRA on that point.

Ingratitude is ever considered a base sin. If this is not such, what shall we call it? Yea, is it not a base return for past kindnesses? Think of yourself, dear reader, holding up your long tried and best friends as a body before a congregation, and raising the derisive laugh at their expense night after night! He may say it was their doctrines or some persons among them that he thus treated. Does he not know that in no other way could he wound the feelings of old friends so much as by holding up to ridicule their religious belief or the friends they hold most dear? Does he say it was necessary to show up the iniquity of our doctrine? How about his statement, then, that there was no other church in which there were so many

0199

Christians, proportionally, as among S.D.Adventists? He said this himself after he had given up our faith. Is a doctrine very terrible or dangerous which develops more Christians in proportion to numbers than any other? He goes from place to place giving discourses every night for a solid week, every one aimed against his former brethren with whom he has lived in friendship and sympathy for twenty-eight years, ridiculing, defaming, and bringing them into the greatest disrepute, and doing so without a single discourse having been given against him on our part, or any public attack upon him whatever. If this be not a base return for past kindness, what is it? And yet we are bound to accept his statement: "I have tried to do what I thought was right."

2. His unchristian course as a minister of the gospel.

Having shown the ingratitude of Eld. C. according to the plainest principles of common justice, we next notice how this course looks according to the higher code of Christian ethics. He has been a Christian minister for more than twenty years, and of late since he has left our people, he claims to have had special light concerning the gospel.

Having discarded the old law, he has been illuminated by the full blaze of the gospel sunlight. We have a right, then, to expect of him a close imitation of Christ, the great Master, whom he claims now to specially serve. Will he inform us where the meek and lowly Man of Calvary ever went from place to place for two dollars a day, and in eight or ten long discourses held up for ridicule the worshipers of the true God, and the followers of Jesus himself. Eld. C.'s former brethren may be poor, perhaps, and unlearned, and possibly very faulty, yet as he himself admits, many of them are true Christians. Did our Saviour ever do this to any class, whether heathen, Samaritans, Pharisees, or Sadducees, to say nothing of his own disciples? He commands all of his followers to do good to those who hate them, and to pray for those who do spitefully use them. He prayed for his enemies who were murdering him, and when reviled, reviled not again; and he requires all to do good for evil. His ministers are required to follow his example more closely than other Christians. Will the Elder find any example for his present course in the lives of the apostles, or any authority for it in any of their writings? If so, let us have the chapter and verse. He knows these things as well as we do. He is perfectly familiar with the

0200

many commands of Christ requiring love, meekness, mercy and humility, even toward those who have wronged us, and rebuking scorn, derision, ingratitude, and such a course as he is pursuing. He knows the apostle's statement, that "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." An "unchristian" course is one that is contrary to the teachings of Christ. Any candid mind can see that his course in pursuing a Christian people as he has, and holding them up to ridicule, has been utterly contrary to Christ's life and teachings. And yet we must not be uncharitable, but accept his statement, "I have tried to do what I thought was right."

3. His treatment of the dead. The readers of the Extra have not forgotten Eld. Canright's treatment of Eld. White, the honored pioneer in this religious movement. He characterizes him in the Des Moines Oracle as a tyrant, "domineering over" this people, and claims that whole Conferences sat "for hours like whipped dogs" under his "terrible denunciations," and that he "quarreled" with all his leading brethren, etc.etc. We knew him as well as he, and know these representations to be grossly unjust, a veritable caricature of a man with some faults and many noble qualities, a devoted, earnest, sacrificing Christian whose life was worn out prematurely by his untiring and unselfish labor in his Master's cause. He admits Eld. White's readiness to confess his faults and mistakes, and says he at times made confessions to him, - a sure sign of an earnest purpose to do right. They were fast friends for many years. Eld. White indeed showed often a special interest in, and kindness toward, him, and treated him as an own son. At the time of his death, we are sure he felt kindly toward Eld. Canright. Yet Eld. C. does not hesitate to take up his old friend who sleeps in death, and parade before the world and hosts who never knew him, a grossly exaggerated statement of his faults and a most unjust view of his character. In the world around us, whose standard of propriety is far too low, there is a general acknowledgment that the memory of the dead, who cannot defend themselves, should be respected. What shall we say, then, of a Christian minister, whom the Bible commands to speak evil of no man, when he, because of a change of

religious views, proceeds remorselessly to break the cerements of the tomb, and drag before the public an old friend five years dead, and parade through the public prints to exulting enemies, grossly

0201

unjust statements concerning his character? Eld. White was highly respected by leading citizens where he was best known. His biography was published among others in the list of prominent citizens of the State of Michigan, as a man worthy of honor, for energy, breadth of mind, and Christian philanthropy. But it is left for one who for years ate at his table, associated with him in the most familiar manner as a personal friend, a brother in Christian fellowship, to now drag his supposed faults before a cold world, and denounce him as tyrannical, a quarrelsome, domineering man worthy of little respect. But the Elder says, "I have tried to do what I thought was right," and we are, of course, bound to believe him.

3. His treatment of Mrs. White. For a full description of Eld. Canright's course toward her, we refer the reader to the article in the former EXTRA, where it is presented at length. In his reply herein published, he makes no complaint of injustice in this particular in the EXTRA. In that article, it will be seen that at one time when it will suit his purpose, he presents her as being "as good a woman as he knew." "Her piety was unquestioned." "She was a kind-hearted woman, philanthropic, charitable, and gentle in her life, and ever evinced a love for humanity." And "she was doubtless honest in supposing she had revelations," etc., and much more of this complimentary talk. But when he chose to take the other side of the question, he denounced her as acting a hypocritical part, talking "as smooth as oil" before the public, but making statements to her own people that were "shamefully false;" and declared that her course was so wicked that it ought to "shut her out of every pulpit in the land;" that she rules her "people with a rod of iron," and "condemns everybody who rejects her testimonies." He compares her work with that of Joseph Smith, Joanna Southcott, and Ann Lee, giving them the preference in point of ability or excellence, and in their proof of inspiration, and really sets the Mormons, Shakers, and followers of Southcott far in advance of the S.D. Adventists. In thus doing, a man of his parts, if he stopped to reflect a moment, must see that he utterly contradicts his own statements made over and over, as we clearly showed in the EXTRA, and proved them to be utterly unreliable.

We here inquire, What cause has he for thus treating Mrs.

0202

White? What injury has she done him? How has she provoked his wrath, and where did she do him any wrong? He has never informed us. No, he has not even given us a hint of anything of the kind. Why, then, should he feel called upon to parade her name through column after column of the public prints, when, according to his own statements since he became a Baptist minister, she was "as good a woman as he knew," "her piety was unquestioned," she was "kind-hearted," "philanthropic," and "ever evinced a love for humanity." These were his own statements at Otsego, Mich., before a public congregation in the Baptist church where he was pastor. From that day to this, to the best

of our knowledge, Mrs. White has never referred to him in print or in public speaking. She has used him well, has been like a mother to him in the past, and only a year or two before he began this raid upon her, he was very glad to have her make a home at his house through a series of meetings; and when they parted last, they did so as warm friends. And now he can hold her up to ridicule, excite the derisive laugh, and sneeringly speak of her as the "prophetess" before a public congregation or in print. Is this a consistent course for a Christian minister to take toward a lady, as "good a woman as he knew"? Is this politeness? Is this being "courteous" to all, as the Bible commands him? Is this doing as he would be done by? Should a minister of Jesus Christ repay kindness with bitterness and public denunciation, simply because he has changed his religious views? Such conduct seems to the writer to be not only unchristian but utterly ungentlemanly. Yet the Elder assures us he has all the while "tried to do what he thought was right," and it would not be courteous to question his word.

4. His untruthful representations of our positions. Eld. Canright, two or three weeks since, had a very triumphant(?) meeting near Bushnell, Mich., during which he "exposed" S.D. Adventism in eight solid discourses, at the rate of two dollars per day and some extra collections thrown in, much to the satisfaction of many who wish us ill, but without any damage to ourselves. Eld. I.D. Van Horn was present a portion of the time, and replied to his attacks. He makes the following statements:-

St. Charles, Mich., Feb. 6, 1888.

Having recently had the opportunity of hearing Eld. Canright in his raid against his former brethren, the S.D. Adventists,

0203

I can truthfully say that he often uses unfair and dishonorable means to carry his points, to prejudice the people against us. This is seen in his gross misrepresentations of points of our faith which he must surely know by his long experience with our people. I will give one instance: He stated plainly, before a crowded house, "that S.D. Adventists have believed and taught that Sunday is the mark of the beast, and that all who have kept Sunday and who are now keeping it, have had, and now have the mark of the beast. Their prophetess, Mrs. White, says so in 'Vol. IV., Great Controversy,' page 281. She says: 'The keeping of the counterfeit Sabbath is the reception of the mark.'"

Taking this sentence out from its connection, and using it in the manner he did, is a direct falsehood against Sr. White, and against the whole body of S.D. Adventists. Any one taking the pains to read the whole paragraph in which this sentence is found, must arrive at this conclusion.

I.D. Van Horn.

Eld. Van Horn is well known as one of the most candid and careful of men in his statements. Eld. Canright himself indorsed him before that public congregation as an "honest man and a Christian;" besides, a crowd of people heard him at the time. We must express our astonishment that Eld. C. should make such statements as these, and we can account for it only by the fact that he is evidently driven on and controlled by a spirit which makes him utterly reckless. Lest the reader will think this a harsh statement, we

will present a few facts. We quote a few statements from our standard works, which have been long in print, to show the position of our people on this subject:-

It will be said again, Then all Sunday-keepers have the mark of the beast; then all the good of past ages who kept this day had the mark of the beast; then Luther, Whitefield, the Wesleys, and all who have done a good and noble work of reformation had the mark of the beast; then all the blessings that have been poured upon the reformed churches have been poured upon those who had the mark of the beast. We answer, No! And we are sorry to say that some professedly religious teachers, though many times corrected, persist in misrepresenting us on this point. We have never so held; we have never so taught. Our premises lead to no such conclusions. Give ear: The mark and worship of the beast are enforced by the two-horned beast. The receiving of the mark of the beast is a specific act which the two-horned beast is to cause to be done.

0204

The third message of Revelation 14 is a warning mercifully sent out in advance, to prepare the people for the coming danger. There can therefore be no worship of the beast, nor reception of his mark, such as is contemplated in the prophecy, till it is enforced by the two-horned beast. - Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation, pp.602, 603.

Much more of the same kind follows. Again:-

We know the objection which will here immediately fly to the lips of an opponent. He will say, Then all Sunday-keepers past or present, however eminent as servants of God, have had or now have the mark of the beast. And we quickly answer, Not one. Why? - Because they have not kept it, and are not keeping it, with the issue before them presented in the prophecy. They have supposed they were keeping the fourth commandment according to the will of God." - Synopsis of Present Truth, p.59.

Much more to the same intent might be taken from this work, and also from the "Marvel of Nations," pp.184, 185. These are all standard works with which Eld. C. was well acquainted. He has known these were the positions of our people for a quarter of a century. And having been with him in tent labor four different tent seasons, I personally know that he taught the same thing, and did not teach that the honest Christians of the past had the mark of the beast. He ever argued against that idea with all his might. How, then, dare he make such statements?

But he must not fail, of course, to give Mrs. White a thrust, so he says:-

Their prophetess, Mrs. White, says so in "Vol.IV., Great Controversy," p. 281. She says: "The keeping of the counterfeit Sabbath is the reception of the mark."

To show how the Elder longs to "do what he thinks is right," we will quote verbatim from Mrs. White, on the page he cites and the connection on p.282:-

That institution [the Sabbath] which points to God as the Creator, is a sign of his rightful authority over the beings he has made. The change of the Sabbath is the sign, or mark, of the authority of the Romish Church. Those who, understanding the claims of the fourth commandment, choose to observe the false in place of the true Sabbath, are thereby paying homage to that power by which alone it is commanded. The change in the fourth commandment is the change pointed out in the

0205

prophecy, and the keeping of the counterfeit Sabbath is the reception of the mark. But Christians of past generations observed the first day, supposing that they were keeping the Bible Sabbath, and there are in the churches of to-day many who honestly believe that Sunday is the Sabbath of divine appointment. None of these have received the mark of the beast. There are true Christians in every church, not excepting the Roman Catholic communion. The test upon the question does not come until Sunday observance is enforced by law, and the world is enlightened concerning the obligation of the true Sabbath. Not until the issue is thus plainly set before the people, and they are brought to choose between the commandments of God and the commandments of men, will those who continue in transgression receive the mark of the beast.

My candid reader, what do you think of the conscientiousness of the man with these words before him, who can say emphatically before a public congregation, "S.D.Adventists have believed and taught that Sunday is the mark of the beast, and that all who have kept Sunday, and who are now keeping it, have had and now have the mark of the beast. Their prophetess, Mrs. White, says so in 'Vol.IV., Great Controversy,' p.281"?

We know he must have read this very language; for he quotes a sentence out of its connection, which he could not have done had he not read it. What can you make of that but a willful perversion of the truth, a square falsehood? We are astonished beyond measure that a man who has known for more than twenty years what S.D.Adventists have taught on this subject, should dare to say what he does! We can make some allowance for one not acquainted with the facts, but not for him. He knows better.

But I suppose we must again return to his oft-quoted statement: "I have tried to do what I thought was right." Poor man! He must have "tried" and grievously failed. He is so driven to desperation by that spirit of hatred that he cannot control himself. Such progress has he made in one short year, under his new and improved religion.

We now draw this article to its close. We pity Eld. Canright, and wish to fling no unkind epithets at him. We have tried to weigh the condition of his present moral sense, and, alas! it seems to have woefully deteriorated. So we should expect of a man who casts aside the law of God, and runs the race he has. He will doubtless go on trying to "do what he

0206

thinks is right," and we expect to find in him the bitterest of opponents. Holy Writ informs us that there are "blind leaders of the blind," and those who "believe a lie." But the end they reach in either case is not desirable. We would gladly help such, but we know not how. When forced, as in this case, to consider the crooked, slippery ways of opposers of the truth, we must for the truth's sake and the cause of God speak plain, and strip off the covering of deception, and expose the hiding-place of iniquity. We dislike, however, to have to do this work, and much prefer to preach the truth of God and labor for the salvation of precious souls.

G.I.B.

A STRAW

WE present as a theological curiosity, and as an evidence of pastoral consistency(?), the following leaflet, which Eld. Canright himself was seen to circulate with his own hand, in a revival meeting in his own church at Otsego, Mich., a few weeks since, according to the statement of an eye-witness, and which very likely he prepared with his own pen:-

WHY AM I NOT A CHRISTIAN?

1. Is it because I am afraid of ridicule and of what others may say of me?
"Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed."
2. Is it because of the inconsistencies of professing Christians?
"Every man shall give an account of himself to God."
3. Is it because I am not willing to give up all to Christ?
"What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"
4. Is it because I am afraid that I shall not be accepted?
"Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out."
 5. Is it because I fear I am too great a sinner?
"The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin."
 6. Is it because I am afraid I shall not hold out?
"He that hath begun a good work in you will perform it unto the day of Jesus Christ."
7. Is it because I am thinking that I will do as well as I can, and that God ought to be satisfied with that?
"Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all."

0207

8. Is it because I am postponing the matter, without any definite reason?
"Boast not thyself of to-morrow; for thou knowest not what a day may bring forth."

Will You be a Christian NOW?

It will be noticed that a reply to one question in the list, we have italicized. We have no fault to find with the leaflet, or the portion emphasized above. It is very good. But we quote the remaining part of the scripture in full from which this is taken. James 2:8-12: "If ye fulfill the royal law according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well: but if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said [or, that law which said, margin],

Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law. So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty."

This glorious text shows so clearly the kingly authority of the law of ten commandments, the binding force of each and every command contained in it, the fact that it is the standard by which we shall be judged in the last day, that it is the law which condemns men now, and that true liberty is to be found only by obedience to every one of its requirements after we have been forgiven the sins caused by its transgression, yet Eld. Canright is everywhere trying to show that this law is "abolished," "done away," "nailed to the cross," and gone forever; and that one of its commands (the fourth, concerning the Sabbath) is better broken than kept. Yet when holding a revival meeting in his own church, he quotes a portion of it in order to impress the mind of sinners with the necessity of obeying God wholly. Thus he can blow cold and blow hot on the same subject, hold on to a portion of the decalogue where it seems to serve his purpose, and abolish the whole when fighting the Adventists, and take contradictory positions whenever the public demand seems to require.

Such "a straw" indeed shows how the wind blows, and emphasizes the sentiment, "O Consistency, thou art a jewel!" This is being all things to all men with a vengeance.

G.I.B.

0208

THE "GRAVEST" "WRONG STATEMENTS."

IT will be noticed that Eld. Canright, in his reply to the EXTRA, printed in this issue, complaining of the treatment he has received, and the "injustice" done him, and the "wrong statements" we have made concerning him which he demands we should correct, states that he presents a few of the "gravest" mistakes to be found in the EXTRA. He intimates that there are others, "half truths" or matters colored somewhat, and points on which we have been misinformed, etc., which he will not present. But he has singled out a few of the gravest" cases, and calls upon us, if we have any sense of fairness, to make reparation in public for such injuries to his good name and reputation. He then presents the three points we have noticed. The discerning reader can see for himself from the charges of Eld. C. and our replies to the same, how far astray we were in our statements. We are certain we have done the Elder no wrong whatever. Our criticisms upon his course in the EXTRA, on the very points about which he complains, are substantially and amply justified by the facts we have presented, whether or not there were any slight technical errors in our statements. He has utterly failed to make the point against us he has undertaken to make. Our charges fall back upon him after a careful examination, with greater weight than in our original statements in the EXTRA. He will certainly have to try again if he hopes to break their force.

But how can he do this, when in the very article from his pen, here presented, after a month's opportunity of studying the EXTRA, he states over his own signature that these three particulars which he cites are the "gravest" "wrong statements" we have made. He says these are the most objectionable points he can find. If these are the "gravest",

and he utterly fails to prove any injustice against us whatever, how will he be able hereafter to deny the charges made against him in the EXTRA?

The word "gravest," according to Webster, means, the most serious, the most important. All other statements, then, in the EXTRA, which he thinks somewhat objectionable, are less serious than these he cites. The ones quoted have plainly no force, and utterly fail to show any wrong done him. Therefore, after weeks of

0209

time in which to hunt up something to turn against us, he virtually admits the substantial justice of our charges against him. Our statements in the EXTRA, concerning Eld. Canright's course, we well knew were serious and grave, and they were many in number. We knew full well that possibly they might strike a person unacquainted with the facts, as being extreme. But the unchristian course which he has pursued for months past, demanded plain talk and explicit and emphatic statements of his evil conduct. The EXTRA was a large sheet, containing a great amount of this kind of matter. One could hardly hope in so many words to exactly express every charge without a single mistake. But we knew there was no intentional wrong, and were very sure there were no errors of importance. And now, after weeks have passed, Eld. Canright, after much study, with plenty of time in which to do a thorough job, presents two or three statements where he claims we have done him an injury. These, he tells us, are the most serious ones he can find. We have plainly demonstrated the justice of our original statements, and he utterly fails to show that we have done him any injustice whatever. Thus we claim that Eld. Canright himself virtually indorses the EXTRA as true, and its statements incontrovertible. Let this virtual admission not be forgotten.

G.I.B